THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXV OCTOBER, 1937 No. 208

EDITORIAL

We recently published an article which contained a description of a Church service attended by a traveller. It was favourable so far as the report on the earnestness and zeal of the priest was concerned, but the writer of it found himself unable to commend the ecclesiastical presuppositions which seemed to lie behind the ordering of the service. Four correspondents—some known to us and all respected—wrote to express regret at the publication of such an article. Facts also came to our knowledge regarding the church which was apparently referred to—its identity was at first unknown to us—and it seemed, as we said, more kind to close the little series of two, or as it afterwards proved, three articles, than to pursue the subject. Since then three things have happened. Two letters came from correspondents heartily approving what had been written. We quote from one of them: "I do not always think that a word from me of approval or of disapproval to the Editor of a magazine can make much difference. Hence I rarely write to Editors. Not only that, but if I were to write whenever I approved of something in Theology, I should have to write every month, and that would be a nuisance to me and a bore to you. But as opinion is called for in this instance, may I say how strongly I approved the article in question, and how I rejoiced that a judgment of 'mere externals' was not considered inconsistent with a serious interest in theology. I should like more."

About the same time the writer of the article—a youngish layman, a servant of the arts, who has already done devoted and valuable service to the Church—wrote rather disappointedly. He supposed, naturally enough but erroneously, that the mention of unkindness, as a thing to be avoided, related to

himself. This was a mistake. It was mentioned only as a guiding principle for the Editor. But he went on to suggest that, so far as unkindness was concerned, many laymen felt a real grievance when they went to a strange church, and where they hoped, and were indeed lawfully entitled, to find the Prayer Book service, conducted after the Prayer Book method, they in fact encountered something else. The priest, said Mr. X in effect, is a professional officer, pledged to discipline. The layman may fairly expect legal tender.

This carries the question beyond the particular case where it arose, a case where irregularities and idiosyncrasies, perhaps slight, do not themselves positively involve, but only suggest, the larger issue of essential loyalty. It could hardly, we think, be seriously denied that there are among us certain consistent and deliberate procedures which undoubtedly raise that issue. Meantime, another letter was received from a reader of seven years' standing. It said: "I think the time has come when I might venture to send you a mild protest against the narrow outlook of many of your articles. There may be a virtue in trying to keep the Church of England in a proud insularity, as unlike the rest of Western Christendom as possible, but is there any need to be continually reminding your readers of this in almost every issue ? A month or two ago we were presented with an article which *even you yourself* (italics ours) appeared to recognize was not quite in good taste, and a similar offence (of a less glaring kind) is repeated in the July number in the article on the Cowley Missal. It seems to me that, if THEOLOGY really does claim to be a Journal of Historic Christianity, it should aim at something bigger than presenting us with the opinions of the official or 'No Party' party in the Church of England !"

This is an important matter. This is not the passing comment of a visitor on the liturgical or ceremonial customs of St. Aloysius, Blankbeach. It involves the momentous question of the future of the Church of England. There are in the letters four terms which deserve comment: (1) "Narrow." No one enjoys being called narrow, and after the exhilarating and (as it seemed) enlarging experience of fraternizing at the Oxford Conference with Orthodox, Old Catholics, Swedes, Anglicans from U.S.A., from the Dominions, from the younger Churches, and hosts of Protestants from all over the world, it was unusually hard to bear. It must, of course, be gladly

borne from other quarters. There are those to whom any sort of Christian seems hopelessly *vieux jeu*, a queer survival from pre-post-war days. This is of course to be welcomed, the essential confirmation of convictions which come not from the temporal but from the eternal world. But, apart from such primary considerations as the validity of the Apostles' Creed, is it narrow, or blameworthy, to be content to wear your own uniform, to obey your own words of command, to speak your own tongue? Is not language a fair parallel? Has Oliver or Samuel made a fairer and larger contribution to the literature of both England and the world? Mr. A. P. Herbert reminds us that many of our verbal Latinizers are very far from being Johnsons. The business man who writes, "*In re* the anticipated event of the unsolicited receipt of subsequent communications of similar significance, a recourse to judicial proceedings to finally terminate inter-firm relationships will be inevitably necessitated," does not really know any Latin, and has probably protested in his time against the waste of money involved in attempting to give to his sons a classical education. And yet he is a Romanizer.

> Strange things, they said, were in his prose,
> Canine to a degree.

Or, as St. Paul put it, "Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?"

Why this severity? Because a great deal of the contemporary Latinizing is, like the epistolary Latinizing of Messrs. Midas and Mammon, an unskilful borrowing of things hardly worth having, the use of which their owners are beginning to abandon. Our correspondent charges us with (2) "insularity," or, as he will have it, "proud insularity." There is a phrase in the manual which is common to our correspondent and ourselves, "we condemn no other nation." It is indeed the bare minimum. There is no one who would not desire in such a matter to "surpass," as the Epistle to Diognetus has it, "the law with his life." It is a simple and happy duty not merely to avoid condemning but to have the heartiest admiration for the ways of others. In particular, it is to be noted that some of the finest minds in the Roman Catholic Church are of what is called the Liturgical School. That is to say, they are eager to extract and use the virtue of the historical tradition which they have inherited. It is a wise principle. Every part of Christendom is surely bound in honour to make the most of its own resources, to make the greatest possible contribution to the kingdom of the

truth. So, in things of the world, internationalism is achieved. So, in things of the spirit, Catholicism is more and more embodied. The Liturgical Movement among Roman Catholics is a strong and sane way of discouraging individualism and promoting Catholic solidarity. Obedience to the Prayer Book is our way of doing the same thing.

---

(3) "As unlike the rest of Western Christendom as possible." This is, of course, quite extravagant. Either the writer has never witnessed any religious enterprise at all of the kind that does really set out to be as different from Rome as possible, or he is using words without regard to their meaning. THEOLOGY is no more hostile to Rome than the *Classical Review* or the *Historical Review* are to the learning and scholarship of Germany. It may be that these literary organs will occasionally find that a vitiating element of exclusive nationalism has crept into the German view of this or that. Even the *Mathematical Journal* might have occasion to do that, now that Relativity has become a Semitic heresy. If they do, they will say so, in the interests of science. And they will be prepared to receive reminders, if well founded, of like prejudice in themselves. Of hostility there is none. Nor is there any in THEOLOGY. Only we like to see English Churchmen walking about in their own skins. Æsop has a fable about this. His choice of animals was arbitrary, and need not be employed. Let us say rather that the skin of the elephant, however admirable for keeping its own possessor warm and snug, would not really fit the bull. It would be incommodious and draughty.

---

(4) The final charge is that of belonging to "the official or 'No Party' party." Time was when we should have replied to this as Blake to Miller in *Tom Brown at Oxford*, "I' faith, coxswain, these be very bitter words." Is it the inevitable ossification that comes with advancing years? *Quantum mutatus ab illo!* Or worse still, like Milton's Satan,

> into what pit thou seest,
> From what height fallen!

When R. L. S. was young, an old gentleman said to him, "When you are my age, you will think as I do." "I'm afraid I shall," was the reply. Is it so? Is "the handful of silver," is "the riband to stick in his coat" so persuasive that the red flag of youth has been dyed and used to bind the Blue Books of officialdom? Let us examine the charge, as the preacher said,

in a spirit of loving enquiry. We take it that "official" is intended to mean "safety first." But *officium* also means "duty." And is that always banal? The Chestertonian argument for theological orthodoxy might conceivably hold good here. Orthodoxy, he said, is commonly supposed to be dull; it is really a delirious adventure—"the dull heresies sprawling and prostrate, the wild truth reeling but erect." THEOLOGY does not concern itself particularly with safety; it wishes to be a servant of the truth. And for English Churchmen the narrow path of obedience seems to be the real way of truth. We have not been conscious of being uncomfortably jostled by Bishops, Deans, Archdeacons and Canons in our halting journey along that obscure and winding path. Perhaps it is so dark that we have not observed that the legs of many of our fellow-travellers are gaitered. But even if they are, is it fatal? Suppose after all that the Church is really right. If that is so, the supposed millennium, the wished-for day "when all are for a party, and none are for the Church," would be something less than paradise.

A little appreciation of the work of B. H. Streeter, written for this number, proved over-long to insert after the proof had already gone into pages. It will appear next month.

We omitted to state last month that the Bishop of Chichester's charge is published by Messrs. Mowbray at 2s.

PASTORAL PROBLEMS AND THEOLOGICAL STUDY

Introduction

A good many complaints have been raised, particularly by some of the parochial clergy in connection with the Way of Renewal, that the outlines of study put before them have been too academic and remote from the practical work of the ministry. These complaints have not lacked foundation. The syllabuses offered for the use of the studies of the clergy have been too academic, and the writers do not appear to have had much, if any, pastoral experience, or to have visualized practical experiences; they have treated their subjects in a dry and intellectualist manner as if they were mental exercises, and not instinct with vital and urgent meaning and demands. It is the purpose of the present writer, who has had pastoral experience both town and country as well as academic, to try to correct the error and make good the deficiency and to shew some of the ways in which our traditional theology bears upon the practical problems of our parishes. But before coming to actual concrete problems and illustrations it is necessary to call attention to matters which many dismiss as academic, but are nevertheless matters of concrete fact which have to be reckoned with in any adequate and complete attempt to discharge the work of the ministry.

In the first place there is such a thing as truth, and truth is truth of reason as well as truth of life. There is a rational, intelligible theory underlying the universe; man has the capacity of understanding, as well as faculties spiritual and moral and corporal; and some men are conscious of their intellectual faculty. All these are part of the human make-up and of human experience, and religion is concerned with the whole man—*i.e.*, it is not merely pietism or morality. And the claim is well founded that correct practice in any activity can only be guaranteed by a consciously perceived correct theory, and this is to be obtained largely by our experience of the past as well as by experiment in the present. The objective of Christianity is truth of life in the fullest sense, as that of medicine is complete health; if the doctor needs to know the theory of health, with the structure of the human body and its diseases, and the pharmacopœia, then the priest needs to know the theory of life, physical, moral, spiritual, social and individual, plus the make-up of the human ego, the enemies of human life, and the

remedies available for its defence and its restoration. Also life involves growth, and truth is not static; nor is truth complete, at all events as far as man's perception of it goes. Life is always changing and truth is always needing fresh expression and adaptation and application. The faith was once delivered to the saints, but the conditions under which saintship is achieved are always varying, and there are many stages on the road to perfection. Life, further, is a whole, so that spiritual, moral, intellectual and physical life are all interdependent, and this means that the neglect of any one aspect is detrimental to the rest.

And we find that the intellectual side of life has been recognized by Christianity from the first. A good many of Our Lord's words were addressed to His hearers' intelligence, and designed to make them think; they were concerned with the current concepts and dogmas of the day which He challenged and corrected and added to. The New Testament is full of intellectual explanations, arguments, appeals to reason, even dogmatic assertions, as are the writings of the Old Testament prophets, and both were written for ordinary people and not for scholars. Phil. ii. is a good instance of how St. Paul emphasizes the bearing of a theological belief on a human situation and need.

No one would accuse St. John of being deficient in spiritual or moral emphasis, yet in his first epistle he insists on intellectual truth as of as great necessity as the other varieties. Accurate teaching has always been urged by the leaders of the Church; it was one of the strengths of the Tractarian movement; and the reason why certain of the Church's devotions, such as the Te Deum, the Creed, and some hymns (early, medieval and modern), are so satisfying is that they appeal to our heads as well as to our hearts. When the complaint is made that things are too academic, the complaint is not against the use of the intellect, but against its wrong use, and the complaint constitutes a challenge, and a demand that we regain its right use. With cheap and ignorant criticisms we need not here concern ourselves, such as Pope's, " He can't be wrong whose life is in the right," and the protest, " I don't want no doctrine—the ' Our Father ' is good enough for me," beyond pointing out that a man must know what is the right sort of life before he can follow it, and that this involves a theory and doctrine, and, before long, an explanation of the Person of Christ, which means theology; and that in the two words " Our Father " are contained at least three theological assumptions.

As a matter of fact, all theology has been the outcome of some situation or problem; it has arisen from some human

need; the matters dealt with by it have been living issues, and they may well be so again; many of them are, because there are a number of fundamental problems which lie constantly at the back of human life, and repeatedly present themselves and demand attention. Already we are made aware by this, not only of the need and value of philosophical and doctrinal studies, but also of historical, because history is the record of human experience, and tells us what practical problems men have had to face, and how they have tried to solve them, and with what success. And both philosophers and historians need the help of the textual critic, in order to ensure the accuracy and the genuineness of the records which they use.

The Parish Priest cannot do his work without study. He is commissioned to preach a Gospel, to teach a Faith; he is the leader of Worship, the shepherd of souls, a ruler of the flock. If he learns and gives his message merely by rote, accepts a cult merely on authority, retails set phrases and practices to individuals, administers his parish according to custom only, all his work is mechanical; it tends to become lifeless and uninspiring, and he is quite incapable of meeting new situations with any prospect of real success. None of us but has been faced with questions when visiting, by people interested or perplexed or distressed, and some of these questions are not capable of short or easy answers. Not the least of his tasks, when questions are raised, and arguments begun, is not the disentangling of the intellectual difficulty, and giving the correct answers, the defence and commendation of his own solution and message, but the preservation of the moral and spiritual elements, the direction and keeping of the discussion on the right plane.

There are big matters, which come up from time to time, and arouse people, even the least intellectual, and demand pulpit treatment, and when in spite of education, the cheap press, cheap literature, and the wireless, our people are in the main not really educated or trained to think and act intelligently, then it is all the more imperative that the Parish Priest shall know how to correct their mistakes, to complete their deficiencies, and to put them on to the right lines. Whether he has schools or colleges in his care, and contacts with school teachers or not, his work is always more or less educational, which is only another way of saying that his work is training souls for Heaven.

(In connection with the foregoing, we would recommend the paper by Professor N. P. Williams in the report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress of 1921; a chapter on " The Dogmatic Basis of Moral and Ascetic Theology," in Dom Bede Frost's *Theory*

and Practice of Penance, and an appendix in the same writer's *Priesthood and Prayer*.)

1. *Belief in God.* (W.R. Syllabus, Nos. 2-5.)

This subject, at first sight the most abstract and remote from affairs, will be found eventually to be the most " practical " of all; there is no situation of human life which is not affected by it. By " God " is normally understood a Power who was the originator of the universe and its inhabitants, and is still its active controller; therefore it must make all the difference to man's attitude to life and to his conduct and activities whether this belief is true or not, and what it involves. Certainly, the Prophets were convinced that it mattered intensely (*cf.* Hosea, Isaiah); much of Our Lord's teaching dealt with what theologians call " the doctrine of God," and it is to be noted that the first part of the report of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 recalled us to this as the most urgent need of our time. The more one studies it, the more vital does it appear; and it will be found to underlie and govern all the problems which are outlined in the following chapters. That there is a God is, of course, an axiom of all religions, and the reason why people pray and worship and follow what they call their religious instincts; but it must make a very great difference to men's worship and their devotional life, what God is like and how they regard Him. In human relationships we frame our attitude to one another according to the temperament, character, experience and outlook of the other person, and the success of our relationship depends on the fullness and accuracy of our knowledge of each other. So that if we wish to approach God with any success and gratification on both sides, it stands to reason that we must know as much about each other as we possibly can.

In practice, most people take the existence of God for granted; it is a convention which they have inherited, and they accept it without thinking, and therefore unintelligently. Here is a first problem, how to make them think.

Because they have seldom thought about Him, their ideas of God are vague, confused, inconsistent, inadequate, mistaken, and call for correction and completion. Christianity does not only assert that there is a God, but it teaches that God is of a particular nature and character, so that this apparently " theoretical " abstract teaching is really supremely practical, not the less because it is based on " practical experience." Christianity also asserts, like the Jewish religion, that religion and life—*i.e.*, conduct—are inextricably woven together, they may not be separated from each other.

Even more practical does the problem appear when it is

realized that moral failure is traceable to defective beliefs about God (*cf.* Hosea, Isaiah). Christianity holds specific beliefs about God, and a priest is charged with teaching these: they are part of his Gospel, his faith; clearly a very practical matter.

The more he studies and thinks about it, the more he will realize its fundamental importance and influence, and the more will he be testing and checking all his activities by these two questions:

(1) How does the fact of God's existence bear on this ?
(2) What sort of a God does this imply ? Is He the God of Christianity ?

There is a very real bearing on worship and the language of worship—*i.e.*, how far are the following phrases correct, adequate or misleading ?

"The only God who fighteth for us."
"High and mighty, King of kings, Lord of lords."
"By the merits of the most precious death and passion of Thy dear Son."
"Offering the Holy Sacrifice."
"Pleading the Holy Sacrifice."

Here are a number of practical issues raised by the belief or disbelief in God:

How did the world originate ?
What is its centre, focus, purpose, destiny ?
What is its controlling force ?
Is it rational, kindly ?
What is man's own nature, place, purpose, destiny ?
Is God capable ? Can we depend on Him ? Does He control everything ? Is there such a thing as Fate or Luck ?
Does God care ? Is He interested in the world or man ? Can I ignore Him ?
What is God like ?
Can I know God, and how ?
What is my particular place and purpose in the world ?
Is the chief end of man "to know and serve God and enjoy Him for ever" ? Am I God's child ?
Does God care for me ? Does He control my life ?
What is the meaning of my experience of life ?

What about evil ? suffering ? Is everything against me ?
Did God make a mistake when He made the world ? When He allowed evil to come ?
Why does my Insurance Policy include "Act of God" as a disaster ?

The belief affects social and political life as well as personal, because in addition to the fact of God's Presence and control, there is the fact that many people believe in it and try to live in accordance with it. These questions therefore arise:

Are current social ideals and regulations and conventions in harmony or relation with this belief—*i.e.*, are our ethical standards and ideals inspired and taught by God, or are they of men's own making ?

What is the motive power behind them ?

Is there any guarantee that they are ultimately valid, and that they will survive and be upheld ?

Are our " Home Policy " and " Foreign Policy " framed and followed in conscious recognition of God ?

Does religion play a recognized part in State affairs ? Local government ?

Is there value in a " State Church "?

Is there provision made in new building areas for the ministrations of religion ?

To-day, the fact and the existence of God is widely and openly challenged, and the claims that religious people make on His behalf are denied. Every priest will meet with men and women who are practical atheists, or at least agnostics, and he must be prepared to meet their challenges and denials. In other words, he must have answers to these questions:

Why must I believe that there is a God ?

Why should it make any difference to me ? and in what ways ?

Can you prove to me that God exists ?

Who made God ?

Why is not rational proof possible or sufficient ?

Is God free ?

Is God personal ?

Does God evolve with the rest of the world ?

Is not " God " merely man's own projection of himself ?

What is God doing now ?

Why doesn't God do something to help people ?

Why doesn't God make the world better ?

If God is love, why does He threaten men with hell and eternal punishment ?

There are also many people who are highly superstitious—*i.e.*, their " belief in God " is clearly not that taught by Christianity.

2. *The Incarnation.* (W.R. Syllabus, No. 6.)

One purpose of the coming of God in human form was the closer union, or reunion, of God and man, both collectively and individually, in order that they might know each other better and live in closer relation and loving harmony. Jesus Christ came to show us what God is like, and what man ought to be like. He is the "Word of God," and therefore God's practical recognition of man's needs, and His way of supplying them.

The problems raised in the previous chapter therefore receive their solution in the Fact, the Person and the Teaching of Jesus Christ. We now know, from actual experience of Jesus, what God is like, His character, His ways and His purpose. We know that God does possess and exercise the supreme power in the world, although He is willing to submit Himself to restrictions and limitations such as are involved in human free will. We know that He is just, holy, and wise, and kindly; that He takes a very real and practical interest in man's affairs, desires his well-being, and goes out of His way, and at great personal cost, to help man. This is all "good news" and therefore part of the "Gospel" which we have to bring to our fellow men for their relief and gratification. We know that God, both from His position as supreme and because of the moral obligation involved in His active benevolence as love, requires, and is entitled to require, obedience from man.

In just the same way as Jesus is "Son of God," so also as "Son of man" He supplies our other need of knowing what we ought to be like—*i.e.*, He gives us the ideal standard of life, both personal and social. This, again, is an intensely pastoral matter. By His own teaching as recorded in the Gospels, and by His personal example, He has given the world an ideal which we claim to be unequalled and unsurpassed by any others with which it can be compared, as, *e.g.*, those of other religions or great teachers, and this ideal, both for the individual and for society, presents a challenge to all intelligent and right-minded people. He has shown that there is a "divine" element in man (which differentiates him from the rest of the created world); that through Him man can effect full contact with God and so "realize" his full nature; that man's moral idealism is a true conception and instinct and that it can be attained and is not an impossible dream. By Him, man's immortality is both asserted and assured (see under "Eschatology"). This, once more, is "good news," and is only another way of saying that Jesus Christ is "the Way, the Truth and the Life."

These two dogmas, that Jesus is both God and man, are therefore at one and the same time the reason of the existence of the Church, and the content and substance of her message. It is because Jesus is both God and man that the Church exists to "evangelize" the world, and this is the "good news" which she brings. Its pastoral, practical bearing is obvious, and it requires, if it is to be adequately presented and upheld, a knowledge of the contents and language of the Gospels; of the reliability of the Gospel text and its transmission; of other religions and their teaching (see under "Comparative Religion"); of other systems of ethics (see under "Ethics"); of the change that the acceptance of Christianity has made in social and personal life, from the first age downward and in all countries, *i.e.* of Church and Missionary history; and of psychology, *i.e.* of human nature.

In personal contacts, *i.e.* in friendly talks and discussions with individuals, the following questions may be asked; they are, as usual, mainly on the intellectual plane, but not exclusively:

What is the real and essential difference between Christianity and other religions? (But note that Hebert, *Liturgy and Society*, asserts that Christianity is a faith rather than a religion; by "religion" he means a human approach to God; by "faith," man's acceptance of God's approach to him.)

Why must we have theology? Is not simple faith in Jesus enough? (Here it should be pointed out that theology is the attempt to explain—*i.e.*, give the reason for—to state how and why certain acts and experiences happened; some people ask these questions and need an answer, if not all. The classical "heresies" about the Person of Christ, Apollinarianism, Sabellianism, Arianism, Nestorianism, Eutychianism, Pelagianism, etc., represent the possible ways of explaining the Fact of Jesus of Nazareth; they were declared "heresies" because each exaggerated one aspect or part of the experience of Him at the cost of or omission or distortion of another part; these mistaken or onesided views are constantly cropping up, so that a knowledge of them is a very practical requirement. Theology is needed in order to justify the Christian claim at the bar of reason, and Jesus' claims for His own Self.)

How can the Christian claim—*i.e.*, that Jesus, Son of Mary, is also Son of God—be justified?

Does "Son of God" mean anything more than "good," just as "Son of Belial" means "worthless, evil"?

Is an "Incarnation" possible? rational?

What is the difference between the Christian belief and the "Incarnations" mentioned in other religions? (*Cf.* "Comparative Religion.")

Why was an Incarnation necessary?

Why was a Virgin Birth necessary?

Is not this impossible, and irrational?

Is this the same as the Immaculate Conception?

How did the belief come that Jesus was Son of God?

If Christ was God, who looked after the world when He was in Palestine?

If Christ was God, how could He pray to God?

3. *The Atonement.* (W.R. Syllabus, No. 7.)

On this subject the two previous studies have bearing. Having learned what God is and is like, what man ought to be like in himself and in his relation to God and his fellow man, we are faced with the problem, only too practical, presented by the fact than man is not what he ought to be; that he has "got across" God, and has "fallen out" with his neighbour, and is "at odds" with himself; *i.e.*, the ideal unity between man and his God, between man and his fellows, and within a man's own personality, does not exist. In other words, at-one-ment (pronounced "at wun") or at-one-ing (*cf. Othello*, iv. 1) is needed. What is called "evil" plays only too large and influential a part in man's experience and spoils all his life and happiness; it is holding up God's purposes. Many would like to be able to explain it, but all have to face it as an actual enemy, and would be content to go without any intellectual explanation if only it could be overcome and removed. This Jesus Christ claims to do, *i.e.* that He has overcome evil and provided the means for its removal; that He has "saved" man, *i.e.* set him free from evil; that He has thereby effected the reunion or at-one-ment between God and man, and between man and man, and brought unity into man's own disordered individual personality; He has at-oned all the parties who needed at-oneing.

The pastoral bearing of this is indicated as follows:

It is, of course, the best part of the "good news."

How can the priest "get it across" to his people?

How can he get in touch with their sense of need (often misconceived and misunderstood)? produce a conviction of sin?

How can he get them to see that the key to all their difficulties is to be found in "union with God"?

How can he bring the "saving, at-one-ing" power of Jesus Christ into their lives, individual and social?

How is it generally made available ?

What part does Sacramental Confession play in the process ? Is it essential for everyone ?

How can the priest make people see that the Cross must always take the central place in our devotional life ?

How can the preacher show that the Cross was central in Our Lord's life, as it is now in the Church's message; *i.e.*, that it was, and is, the " crux " of the whole situation ?

How is the Cross the revelation of both evil and good ?

Does it explain evil in any way ?

How can it be brought to bear on all human problems ?

How is it to be related to life's many " crosses " ?

What is the value, etc., of the " Sign of the Cross " as a personal habit ?

What are the respective values, meaning and symbolism, and the eternal significance, of the Cross and the Crucifix, in Churches and elsewhere ?

How can this teaching, that Jesus Christ, by His death on the Cross—at-oned God and man, and man and man, and man's own self—be expressed and made intelligible and acceptable to the modern mind ? How far is its non-acceptance due to presentations which were inadequate, or misleading, or mistaken, or onesided, or offensive ?

(Here comes in the need for the technical knowledge of the " traditional theories of the Atonement," most of which have been severely and justly criticized.

Also the need of the most careful choice of hymns and other devotions by the Parish Priest, for fear he unconsciously spreads wrong ideas among his people.

And the need of careful explanation of the words and phrases used in the Bible and Prayer Book, *e.g.*, " through faith in His Blood.")

What is the connection between this belief and the two Sacraments of Holy Baptism and Holy Communion ?

Among questions which may be asked are:

Why did Christ have to die ?

Could not He or God have saved us in any other way ?

If Christ had to die, why do we blame Judas, and the Chief Priests, and Pilate ? Why was the Crucifixion wrong ?

Why do you talk of sacrifice ? What do you mean by it ?

Is not sacrifice a debased custom of heathen peoples, long given up by civilized people ?

If sacrifice involves loss, how was Christ's death a gain ?

How did, and how does Christ save us ? And from what ?

Can Christ save us from slums, from sickness, from cancer, from fear, from " nerves," from competition, from Communism, Fascism, Capitalism, from class and sex jealousy, from War ?

What is sin ? Is it doing, or being, or thinking, or all of these ?

How does it shew itself ? How does it come ?

What are its results ?

How can I recognize it ? And cure it ?

(*For a fuller treatment see* THEOLOGY, *June*, 1936.)

4. *The Holy Spirit.* (W.R. Syllabus, No. 8.)

Of all the fundamental beliefs of Christianity this doctrine lies nearest to practical affairs and is concerned closest with practical and pastoral problems. This is clearly implied in the Catechism, where, in the explanation of the Creed, the child is taught to refer the action of both God the Father and God the Son to the past, but the action of God the Holy Spirit to the present—" I believe in God the Father Who hath made me and all the world; in God the Son Who hath redeemed me and all mankind; in God the Holy Ghost Who sanctifieth (note the present tense) me and all the elect people of God." One cannot say that we are to ignore the work of God either as Father or as Son, but it is incontestable that for all practical purposes it is with God as Holy Spirit with whom we have to deal and are chiefly concerned (*cf.* John xiv.-xvi). He is the Spirit of Life, and our great need is life in the fullest and richest sense and degree (what we call eternal life); we need a dynamic which will purify and strengthen and raise the level of our ordinary daily life, which will give more reality and vitality to our religion as part of it, and to our corporate Church life, as that of the Body of Christ energized by His Spirit. We need Power to overcome and remove evil, and to establish the Kingdom (Kingship) of Christ; we need moral power which will develop and establish the moral standards of Christianity, and incidentally place and keep in their true proportions and relations both intellectualism and æstheticism in religion; the sinner, the tempted, the perplexed, the successful, the " ordinary " folk, all need power and help. We need Holiness, and without the Holy Spirit there can be no sense of sin, of penitence or forgiveness; no turning to God, no " new birth," no " sanctification," *i.e.* no growth in moral excellence; no power of sacrifice, no joy of other " fruits and gifts of the Spirit." We need wisdom; without Him there can be no solution of problems, personal or corporate.

It should therefore be abundantly clear that this belief needs very careful and full study, both to establish its truth and to gain a knowledge of the specific ways in which it bears on life and is made available.

For the priest himself, as the minister of Jesus Christ, His representative, sharing His Priesthood, the conveyor of life to those who need it, there must be the conviction of the reality of the Holy Spirit (as, *e.g.*, in his Baptism, Confirmation and Ordination), some intellectual comprehension of His Person and existence, and some personal recognition and knowledge of His presence and working. The priest must be able to look to the Holy Spirit to help him in his teaching—the choice and making of his sermons, in the result which they are intended to bring about. He needs the Holy Spirit when he leads his people in worship, when he administers the Sacraments, when he visits and deals with individuals, when he is framing a policy for his Parish and working out methods; his prayer life is one whole conference with the Holy Spirit. His knowledge of the Holy Spirit will give him the "discerning of spirits" and enable him to recognize spiritual motions in his own soul which are not of God, and to diagnose the spiritual condition and motives of other people, whether in the confessional or not, and to give wise advice and direction when wanted. His "life in the Spirit" ensures the setting by him of a good example.

All matters connected with personal religion, and character training, fall under the influence of belief in the Holy Spirit (*cf.* Isa. xi.): the knowledge of God as well as knowing about God, conscience, the devotional life, prayer, meditation, Bible study; self-knowledge, self-education, self-expression, self-realization, the problem of the lonely life. It shows us that religion consists of a loving personal relationship, and not obedience to a law or code of moral rules. Similarly, all branches of teaching should be controlled by Him and His help used by all thinkers and teachers

A large range of questions comes up to which this belief alone supplies the answer, *e.g.*:

Religious: What is inspiration ?
Is the Bible inspired, and how ? Why do you think so ?
How were the prophets inspired ?
Are there any prophets now ?
Are poets and other teachers inspired ? painters, musicians ?
Does this differ from the inspiration of the Bible ?
How are we to understand and apply the Bible ?
Is modernism wrong ?

Isn't " God " just the projection of our own thoughts and ideals ?

Isn't religion merely auto-suggestion ? a way of escape, or dope ?

" I'm not made religious like some people."

What is the value of mysticism ?

What is the place of art, and æsthetics in religion ? Emotion ?

Is there any truth in faith-healing ? " Christian Science "?

Why doesn't the Church cure diseases to-day ?

Is not the work of the doctor, the nurse, and the psychologist as truly that of Christ and more useful than that of the clergy ?

Moral: What is conscience ?

Is there one moral standard for everyone ?

Why do moral standards vary so much ?

Why are non-religious people often so much better and more attractive than Churchgoers ?

Is not the ordinary man at his best as good as any Christian ?

Does not this show that Christianity is not necessary for everyone, and that anyone can be good if he will ?

Man has his own standards, and needs no " revelation," and no power from outside his own self.

" Truth, beauty, and goodness " give all that a man needs.

How can I make my office, workshop, a better place ?

How can I help a friend who is going wrong ?

(The challenges raised by all fresh " values," idealisms, humanism, and the problems raised by all fresh situations not mentioned in Our Lord's teaching, can only be met by the use of the Holy Spirit in criticizing and analyzing, and in applying and extending to them the principles which He shews us to lie behind Our Lord's words and attitude.)

The belief in and knowledge of the Holy Spirit have a direct bearing on Parish and Church life in these ways:

On the work of the Parochial Church Councils, and all Councils and Committees. (The early Church said: " It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us;" and, " The Spirit suffered us not." This is the ideal for us.)

On the framing of policies, " five-year plans "; the initiation of changes, developments, advances.

On the healing of Parish quarrels and the solution of Parish difficulties.

The place of tradition and its continuance and application. Institutionalism, its value and its dangers and defects.

Evangelism—revivalism; their aims and methods. All mission preaching and the " Group " movement.

The ministry of healing, physical and mental and spiritual.

Reunion.

Problems of Education, of Social Reform, of " a better spirit " in industry, business, etc., and in politics, home and international.

In addition to the usual literature may be mentioned the report on the Liverpool Church Congress, 1926; Canon Raven's *Eternal Spirit*, Hodder, 2s. 6d.; *Meditations on the Holy Spirit*, by the late Canon B. W. Randolph, Mowbray, 2s. 6d.

Devotions and prayers addressed directly to the Holy Spirit may be found at the end of each chapter of G. F. Holden's *Holy Ghost the Comforter*; and in H. J. T. Bennett, *Devotions to the Holy Spirit*, Faith Press, 2s.; E. E. Seyzinger, *Veni Creator*, Mowbray, *Theology*, October, 1934.

S. P. T. Prideaux, D.D.

THE TRIALS OF R. D. HAMPDEN

The year 1936 witnessed the centenary of a controversy which, at the time, seemed destined to have far-reaching effects upon the nature and constitution of the Church of England. Like the controversies which followed it, such as those over *Essays and Reviews*, *Lux Mundi*, Kikuyu, and the Henson appointment, it was really destined to be sterile in all obvious practical effects. The controversy was that which raged over the appointment in 1836 of Renn Dickson Hampden to the Regius Chair of Divinity at Oxford.

On January 19, 1836, Dr. Burton, who had been Regius Professor for some years previously, died suddenly. Instantly speculation ensued in Oxford and indeed elsewhere as to who his successor might be. The Tractarian Movement was fast approaching its height and it was naturally felt that the appointment of one of its adherents would be but a just recognition of the prestige of the movement. Nevertheless, there was an uneasy feeling of apprehension in the air. The Whigs were in power again and Lord Melbourne was always likely to do the unexpected. The appointment was in his

hands inasmuch as it was a Crown one. It would appear that Melbourne took great pains in making his choice. He collected a list of eight names from Archbishop Howley of men who might be suitable for the post. The first name on the list was that of Edward Bouverie Pusey, the Professor of Hebrew. John Henry Newman and John Keble occupied fourth and fifth places respectively. Melbourne sent this list to his friend Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, formerly a fellow of Oriel College, who in turn consulted Edward Coppleston, the former Provost of Oriel, who was now Bishop of Llandaff. Whately and Coppleston while at Oxford had both been members of the " noetic " circle—a group of liberal theologians for the most part domiciled at Oriel. Both apparently felt that, as the strength of religious liberalism had been greatly weakened by recent departures from the University, here was a golden opportunity to rally their strength. They advised Melbourne to ignore all the recommendations of the Archbishop of Canterbury and to appoint R. D. Hampden. The Prime Minister decided to accept their advice and the Archbishop was content quietly to endorse it. It would have been well if the University had been content to do the same. At once, however, a storm began to rage which shook scholastic Oxford to its foundations and whose reverberations were to continue throughout many years. Over forty-five books and pamphlets appeared at the time all attempting to show why or why not, according to the theological temper of the writer, R. D. Hampden was unfit to be Regius Professor of Divinity. We can only essay to pass judgment on the matter if we know something of the man himself.

Renn Dickson Hampden was a descendant of the great John Hampden and the eldest son of Renn Hampden, a Colonel of Militia in Barbados, where he was born on March 29, 1793. At the tender age of five he was sent to England to reside for the next twelve years at Warminster Vicarage, there to be tutored by the vicar, the Rev. M. Rowlandson. On May 9, 1810, he was entered as a commoner at Oriel College and three years later gained a brilliant double first. A year later he was awarded the Chancellor's Latin Essay Prize. For about two more years he remained at Oriel, as a fellow, and Keble, Pusey, Hawkins and Newman were at varying times his contemporaries. Shortly after his marriage in 1816 to Mary, the only daughter of Edward Lovell of Bath, he was ordained to the curacy of Newton, near Bath, subsequently serving in the parishes of Blagdon (where he made the friendship of Mrs. Hannah More), Farringdon, Hungerford and Hackney. He then spent some years in London writing, and in 1827 published his *Essays on the Philosophical*

Evidence of Christianity. This work probably gives us a far greater insight into the mind of R. D. Hampden than any of his later writings. He dwells largely upon his conviction that " the evidence of the natural world has been greatly underrated in the general estimate as a constituent of the great Christian argument."* Hampden goes on to point out that the same laws which exist in the realm of nature reign in the realm of grace. Like the Modernist of to-day, he is opposed to any idea of a " dualism of natural and supernatural." " The same moral and intellectual faculties," he declares, " by which one class of truths is received and adopted must hold good also when applied to the other class; and the judgment thereof affirmed in the system of nature cannot be reversed in the system of grace: for this would imply one mode of thinking and feeling to be applied to one kind of instruction, and another to the other."† Like Erasmus in the sixteenth century, Hampden had been influenced in his thought by Origen, of whom he says that he is " one who has employed analogical reasoning with great force in vindicating the truth of the Christian Religion."‡ Nevertheless, he points out that the analogical argument only takes us so far along the road to truth and that consequently " we cannot therefore consider our mutual knowledge of God as more than relative." Hampden is severely intellectual in his approach to religion. " Where the mind is uncultivated or naturally ardent and susceptible, or unaccustomed to a severity of control in its imaginative powers, there we observe its effects in the enthusiast, the mystic, the fanatic and the superstitious."§

In the autumn of 1829 Hampden returned to his University as a public examiner, and 1832 saw him appointed not only to a tutorship at Oriel College but also to the position of Bampton Lecturer for the year. Both these latter appointments are of some interest. At that time the Provost of Oriel was Edward Hawkins, a religious liberal and a friend of Thomas Arnold. For several years he had had as tutors at Oriel, John Henry Newman, Richard Hurrell Froude, Robert Wilberforce and Joseph Dornford. The tutors, and in particular Newman, desired the more indolent students to be placed together in large classes and the more capable and brilliant students to be left to the direct personal dealings of the tutors. " The bad men," Newman had written early in 1829, " are thrown into large classes, and thus time saved for the better sort, who are put into very small lectures, and principally with their own tutors quite familiarly and chattingly. . . . We hope soon

* *Philosophical Evidence of Christianity* (1827), p. 1.
† *Ibid.*, p. 12. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 213. § *Ibid.*, p. 197.

to gain some Exhibitions or Scholarships."* The scheme, however, did not commend itself to the noetic Provost, who not only felt that the many were being sacrificed for the few but that the tutors were exerting too great a moulding influence upon their students. He could not agree with Newman's view that secular education should be conducted by a tutor as if it were a pastoral cure. There is little doubt, too, that Hawkins saw the rapid drift of the tutors towards High Church opinions. He saw a new school of thought arising in Oriel which would leave him isolated in the very college of which he was Provost. So it is not surprising that he was hostile to a system which placed Newman and his colleagues in such close proximity to the more brilliant students. Vainly, Hawkins attempted to arrive at some sort of compromise with Newman. In the end he had no recourse but to refuse to commit any more students into the charge of the tutors. The result was that, to use Mark Pattison's words, " from this date the college began to go downhill, both in the calibre of the men who obtained fellowships and in the style and tone of the undergraduates."† Hampden was appointed a tutor at Oriel in the hope that he might be able to maintain the intellectual prestige of the college. If he failed to make a permanent impression at Oriel it was probably because he was there for so short a time. The chief point of interest about his association with Oriel is that while there he came under the influence of Hawkins. Hampden's Bampton Lectures on " The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its Relationship to Christian Theology " may have owed a good deal to Hawkins. At that time very little indeed was known in Oxford about the scholastic theology. In his Bampton Lectures, Hampden maintains that the authority of Scripture is greater than that of the Church. The application of reasoning to the data of the Christian Faith, he asserts, had resulted in the development of a complicated technical theology which was really nothing but an immense superstructure of self-deception and of no value to real religion. The scholastic theologians by their elaborate arguments had thought they were establishing religious truths when actually they were simply playing permutations and combinations with a theological language. The fundamental fact of Christianity, for Hampden, was God's revelation of Himself in Christ, with its setting in history and moral implications for the believer. All else, however interesting, was but theory and nothing more. Like Richard Whately, Hampden had a keen historical sense.

Enemies of Hampden wanted to know how he could honestly

* Anne Mozley, *Life and Letters of J. H. Newman* (1890), vol. i., p. 174.
† *Mark Pattison's Memoirs*, p. 23.

recite the creeds in Church. Two answers were suggested. Either he was a fool, or he was a knave. Either too foolish to realize that he had cut the ground from under his own feet, or too much of a knave to trouble his head about the truth of the creeds he recited. The former theory was popularly accepted by the many who had never really read his book, for in his last lecture he anticipates the criticism. Suppose, he demands, that we suddenly became aware, for the very first time, of that divine revelation revealed to us in the Bible. Should we not naturally hesitate to reduce it to " the precision and number of articles " ? However, he continues, " when theoretic views are known to have been held and propagated; when the world has been familiarized to the language of these speculations, and the truth of God is liable to corruption from them; then it is, that forms of exclusion become necessary, and theory must be retorted by theory." The use of theory is only tolerable in religion when it denies wrong notions not specifically sanctioned by revelation. " This is the view which I take not only of our Articles at large, but in particular, of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds. . . . If it be admitted that the notions, on which their several expressions are founded, are both unphilosophical and unscriptural, it must be remembered that they do not impress those notions on the Faith of the Christian as matters of affirmative belief. They only use the terms of ancient theories of Philosophy—theories current in the schools at the time when they were written—to exclude others more obviously injurious to the simplicity of the Faith."* In answer to an imaginary listener who wishes to know why we should go on using them Hampden replies that we do so because the inherent tendency of the human mind to identify words with things is not " a transient phenomenon, peculiar to one age, or one species of philosophy," but " an instinctive propensity of our intellectual nature." If this were not so, Hampden continues, then " the unsoundness of a metaphysical and logical Theology being once fully admitted, that cumbrous machinery might be removed, and the sacred truth allowed to stand forth to view in its own attractive simplicity."† Elsewhere the author concludes that " Dogmas of Theology then, as such, are human authorities."‡

Although it is commonly said that for Newman dogma was the essence of religion, it is strange that in many ways his attitude towards dogma approximated more and more towards that of Hampden as the years passed. His opposition to the

* R. D. Hampden, *Scholastic Philosophy considered in its Relation to Christian Theology* (1837), p. 378.

† *Op. cit.*, p. 380.

‡ *Op. cit.*, p. 375.

promulgation of Papal Infallibility was due not to any disbelief on his own part in it, but simply to the fact that he held that dogmas should be formulated only when the Faith was in danger. "Where we are all at rest," he wrote to Bishop Ullathorne in 1870, ". . . we are told to prepare for something, we know not what, to try our faith we know not how. No impending danger is to be averted, but a great difficulty is to be created."* How much did Newman owe to Hampden?

It was commonly asserted round about 1839, and Tom Mozley repeated the allegation in 1882, that Hampden's Bampton Lectures were inspired by Blanco White. The latter was an ex-Roman Catholic priest who had fled from Spain during Napoleon's invasion. After various vicissitudes he had been received into the Anglican Church and had settled at Oriel College as an honorary member of the Common Room. Between Blanco White, Whately and Hampden a warm friendship existed. But the suggestion made in later years that Hampden's lectures were inspired by Blanco was a very damaging one, inasmuch as in the meantime he had turned Unitarian. So, it was said, it was quite apparent where such speculations as Hampden's led. The charge seemed to be a plausible one because Blanco was one of the few at Oxford who knew anything of Scholasticism. Nevertheless, it was a false one. For many years the study of scholastic philosophy had been Hampden's favourite field. To the seventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* he had contributed articles on "Aristotle and his Philosophy," and to the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana* he had contributed an article on "The Scholastic Philosophy." His *Philosophical Evidence of Christianity*, to which allusion has already been made, published as early as 1822, is an attempt to formulate his theory of the limitations of technical theology. "Those," wrote Archdeacon Hare to the Dean of Chichester, "who are at all acquainted with the writings of what was then called the Oriel School, will clearly perceive that the Bampton Lectures, in their whole tone of thought, both philosophical and theological, are a genuine birth of that school, and did not need a refugee from Seville to graft them into it."† At the time of their delivery the lectures made no great stir and several years were to pass before they were made the occasion of controversy.

In April, 1833, only a few months after his appointment to a tutorship at Oriel, Hampden was nominated by Lord Grenville to the Principalship of St. Mary's Hall, where he received his B.D. and D.D. degrees. As Principal, Hampden

* Ward, *Life of Cardinal Newman*, vol. ii., p. 288.
† *Memorials of Bishop Hampden*, p. 29.

not only spent £4,000 of his own money on improving the structure of the College, but so raised its academic status that for the first time a resident student there was successful in gaining a first-class honours degree. It was in 1834 that, largely as a result of his work at St. Mary's Hall, he was appointed to the Chair of Moral Philosophy, and two years later came his most famous appointment of all.

What sort of man was the Hampden of 1836 ? Dean Church appears to have thought him a rather dull man, saying of him that " his mind, which was a speculative one, was not one, in its own order, of the first class. He had not the grasp nor the subtlety necessary for his task. He had a certain power of statement, but little of co-ordination; he seemed not to have had the power of seeing when his ideas were really irreconcilable, and he thought that simply by insisting on his distinctly orthodox statements he not only balanced, but neutralized, and did away with his distinctly unorthodox ones."* Nevertheless, almost apologetically, Church goes on to say that in Oxford a man " was so close to his neighbours that he was more irritating than if he had been obscured by a crowd." Tom Mozley, writing in old age, said, " Hampden's face was inexpressive, his head was set deep in his broad shoulders, and his voice was harsh and unmodulated. Someone said of him that he stood before you like a milestone, and brayed at you like a jackass. It mattered not what he talked about, it was all the same, for he made one thing as dull as another."† Henry Wilberforce on one occasion said that Hampden had glared at him, and that " he recognized in that glare that gentleman's West Indian blood."‡ From such prejudiced accounts of him one turns to more unbiassed and impartial accounts. A painting of him by the late Sir Daniel Macree, now in the possession of Christ Church, shows him as a grave-faced man of small build. His serious nature probably accounts for the fact that even as a boy he was known as " old Hampden." The painting is that of a perhaps humourless man, but it is certainly not that of a dull and unpleasant man, although the short neck and well-set head may indicate a measure of obstinacy. A lady who knew him well said of him that he had " dark bright eyes that kindled with animation; a clear, brown complexion; dark straight hair, the forehead peculiarly open; a well-proportioned figure, though not tall, and a finely shaped leg and foot."§ A clergyman of the last generation said of

* R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement*, p. 142.

† T. Mozley, *Reminiscences Chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Common Room*, vol. i., p. 380.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 381.

§ G. Faber, *Oxford Apostles*, p. 356.

him to the present writer that he was "simply charming." He may have been so to friends, but an intense shyness deprived him of that power of small talk which goes towards popularity in an Oxford Common Room. He was perhaps a fitting subject to be the occasion of a long-drawn-out controversy.

The Tractarians have frequently been castigated as being solely responsible for the "Hampden Controversy." Prominent they unquestionably were, but not entirely responsible. All kinds of people united to oppose the appointment of a liberal theologian by a Whig Prime Minister to the Regius Chair of Divinity. Gilbert, the Principal of Brasenose, Symons, the Warden of Wadham (a bitter opponent of Tractarianism), Faussett, afterwards the traducer of Pusey, and many others all combined with the Tractarians to oppose the appointment. "Could we not pass a vote," wrote Samuel Wilberforce (later Bishop of Oxford) to his brother Robert, "that Hampden should always preach in Hebrew?"* The suggestion, of course, was intended to be a humorous gibe at Hampden's alleged unorthodoxy. One of the saddest products of the controversy was a pamphlet by Newman written over-night with the help of a borrowed copy of the book entitled *Elucidations of Dr. Hampden's Bampton Lectures*. It consists largely of extracts from the lectures with Newman's comments upon them. No more unfair way of criticizing a book is possible, but the publication of the pamphlet had deadly effects, for it was widely read and Hampden was the more denounced. Its publication at all was in very dubious taste inasmuch as it was well known that Newman not only was an unsuccessful candidate for the Regius Professorship and that Hampden had gone to Hawkins' rescue when he had found himself without tutors, but also that Newman had been disappointed when Hampden instead of himself had been appointed Professor of Moral Philosophy. A quiet amiable man content to follow out his own original line of thought and with no gifts for controversy, Hampden was no match for a merciless controversialist like Newman. A further bone of contention which Hampden's opponents were able to chew was the fact of his having written a tract examining the question of the admission of dissenters to the Universities.

It is difficult now to realize the extent of the tornado which swept Oxford. The very streets became placarded with anti-Hampden posters, and a petition was sent to the King beseeching him to intervene and veto the appointment. King William, who was approaching the end of his life, would do nothing. He had, as someone cynically remarks, "exhausted

* *Life of Samuel Wilberforce*, by R. G. Wilberforce, vol. i., p. 93 (1882).

his devotion to the Church by his famous address to the Bishops." "Another time," insolently remarked Lord Melbourne to Pusey, "it would be wise, if you want anything done, to go to those who can do it." Hampden himself offered to withdraw in view of the storm against the appointment. This offer Lord Melbourne declined to accept. "For the sake of the principles of toleration and free enquiry," he wrote, "we consider ourselves bound to persevere in your appointment." On one occasion when Hampden was despairingly describing the treatment he had received Lord Melbourne put a kindly hand on his shoulder and said, "Be easy; I like an easy man."* To the Archbishop of Canterbury, Hampden wrote: "I trust that I shall be fully believed when I affirm, as I do in the most solemn manner, that I have no thought, in anything I have said or written on theological subjects, but to uphold, to the best of my ability, the doctrines and established formularies of the Church of England. My 'Bampton Lectures' are simply a history of the technical terms of theology; nor have they the slightest tendency in my view and intention to impugn the vital truths of Christianity. My pamphlet entitled 'Observations on Religious Dissent" had no other design, but is indeed a charitable construction of the views of those who differ from us."† Unfortunately, the Archbishop (William Howley) was notoriously a broken reed. "It clearly appears," wrote Hampden to his friend Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, "that the Archbishop has already taken his side; not having deigned even to ask me a question on the subject beforehand; and I find that I am to expect no sympathy, or even fair hearing, from that quarter."‡ On the other hand, the Duke of Sussex wrote to Hampden from Kensington Palace saying, "I viewed and learned with the deepest concern the unfair and unjust attacks which were made on your first edition of the Bampton Lectures. . . . Time which is the best calmer of all passions will, I trust, bring many to their senses who now seem to labour under a brain fever; when I have no doubt they will see their errors, be sorry for the mischief they have inflicted on society and the personal wrong done to you, and make that apology which, as honest men, they ought to do."

Event followed event in Oxford. There were petitions and petitions, including several addressed to the Hebdomadal Board of the University. A Committee was formed which issued a report declaring that Dr. Hampden was guilty of "the assumption that uncontrolled human reason in its present

* *Some Memorials of Bishop Hampden*, edited by Henrietta Hampden (1871), p. 57.

† *Op. cit.*, p. 55.

‡ *Op. cit.*, p. 58.

form is the primary interpreter of God's Word, without any regard to those rules and principles of interpretation which have guided the judgment of Christ's Holy Catholic Church in all ages of its history and under every variety of its warfare." Pusey was commonly alleged to have been the chief author of the report; its phraseology was unquestionably Tractarian. Orthodoxy was in a panic. Convocation met on March 22, 1836, and a resolution was moved declaring that, "Since it is commanded by the University to the Regius Professor of Sacred Theology that he shall be one of the ten of those by whom the select preachers are appointed, and, moreover, that his advice shall be had if any preacher shall be called in question before the Chancellor; but he who is now the Professor, in certain of his published works hath so treated matters theological that the University hath no confidence in him; it is enacted that the Regius Professor shall be deprived of the aforesaid functions until the pleasure of the University be otherwise." This meeting of Convocation was of a very noisy character. Unfortunately for many of those present, speeches had to be made in Latin. One present did indeed try to express himself by speaking in his mother tongue, but no sooner had he uttered the words "Mr. Vice-Chancellor, I trust that we shall have no modern Liberalism or Whiggery here," than he was silenced by a sharp rebuke. The Proctors vetoed the statute before it was put to the vote, but a change in the personnel of the Proctors resulted in its being passed by 474 votes to 94 at a meeting of Convocation in the following May. The sting of the statute, of course, did not lie in its practical results but in the words, "the University hath no confidence in him." The stigma was to remain attached to Hampden's name for the rest of his sojourn in Oxford. He was always acutely conscious of a sense of injustice. "When a censure of the University is passed," he wrote to Lord John Russell on December 15, 1847, "certain propositions are selected from the author's writings, and the decrees of Convocation condemn those particular propositions. Nothing of the kind was ever done in my case, nothing specific was ever alleged against me."* As Regius Professor, Hampden was also vicar of Ewelme from 1836 to 1847, where he was highly esteemed as an exemplary parish priest.

Dean Church makes great play with what he alleges to have been Hampden's ignoble revenge upon the Tractarians by raising difficulties in the way of a Tractarian, Mr. MacMullen, obtaining his B.D. degree. Hampden called upon Mr. MacMullen to defend in his thesis for his degree assertions

* *Life of Samuel Wilberforce*, vol. i., p. 453.

diametrically opposed to all that Tractarians taught. The impression that a reader of Church's account gets is that it was very " much ado about nothing." In the end, however, MacMullen obtained his degree and the B.D. statutes were reformed. It is certainly impossible to blacken Hampden because of the affair in which he appears to have had every right on his side.

On November 15, 1847, *The Times* contained the announcement that Lord John Russell had appointed Professor R. D. Hampden to the Bishopric of Hereford, vacant by the translation of Thomas Musgrave to York. That same day *The Times* in a leading article declared that " there is no party whatever, at least none worth taking into account, to whom the new appointment to the See of Hereford can possibly be agreeable. It is not a question between High Church and Low Church, or between the Church and the Dissenters. Lord John Russell may depend upon it that in appointing Dr. Hampden he has committed a political blunder." The *Weekly Dispatch* of December 19, 1847, declared that " Dr. Hampden is a sound philosopher, but an unsound believer. He has more faith in the moral nature of man than in the three creeds." There was indeed an immediate outcry against the appointment. Thirteen bishops, including Samuel Wilberforce of Oxford, addressed a Remonstrance to the Prime Minister in which they pointed out that Dr. Hampden's theological beliefs were in question inasmuch as he was still resting under a University censure, for an attempt in 1841 to repeal the famous statute of 1836 had failed. Lord Russell in his reply dated December 8 stated:

> " I observe that your lordships do not state any want of confidence on your part in the soundness of Dr. Hampden's doctrine. Your lordships refer me to a decree of the University of Oxford, passed eleven years ago, and founded upon lectures delivered fifteen years ago.
>
> " Since the date of that decree, Dr. Hampden has acted as Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, and many Bishops, as I am told, have required certificates of attendance on his lectures before they proceeded to ordain candidates who had received their education at Oxford. He has likewise preached sermons, for which he has been honoured with the approbation of several prelates of our Church.
>
> " In the circumstances, it appears to me that, should I withdraw my recommendation of Dr. Hampden, which has been sanctioned by the Queen, I should virtually assent

to the doctrine that a decree of the University of Oxford is a perpetual ban of exclusion against a clergyman of eminent learning and irreproachable life, and that in fact, the supremacy which is now by law vested in the Crown is to be transferred to a majority of the members of one of our Universities."*

In reply to a petition against Hampden's appointment signed by five hundred prominent laymen Lord John declared that the appointment was calculated "to strengthen the Protestant character of our Church so seriously threatened of late by many defections to the Church of Rome."†

The Dean of Hereford wrote to Lord John stating that he proposed to vote against the election of Hampden when the matter came up before the Chapter. This elicited the famous reply:

"Sir,

"I had the honour to receive your letter of the 23rd inst., in which you intimate to me your intention of violating the law."

In support of the appointment, fifteen heads of houses at Oxford sent a resolution to Hampden expressing their confidence in his theological integrity. It was reputed that Archbishop Howley had said that he would rather go to the Tower than consecrate Hampden,‡ but opportunity for martyrdom was denied him, for he died at the beginning of 1848 and Hampden was consecrated by John Bird Sumner, the new Archbishop, on March 26, 1848, in Lambeth Chapel. As a Bishop he seems to have been conscientious and hardworking. "He never retaliated," says his biographer, "or referred to the opposition which had been raised against him, and in his life and conduct was an exemplary prelate. He was an evangelical in his views and highly disapproved of the clergy who joined the Church of Rome, and of the re-establishment of the papal hierarchy."§ It is strange, however, that his own troubles did not induce a greater feeling of tolerance in Hampden. On the publication of *Essays and Reviews* we find him addressing a letter to one of the contributors, the Rev. H. B. Williams, in which the Bishop expresses pain "that any clergyman should have published such opinions as those concerning which you have addressed us."‖ In the Upper House of Convocation in a debate on

* *Life of Samuel Wilberforce*, by R. G. Wilberforce, vol. i., p. 439.

† *Ibid.*, p. 440.

‡ See *op. cit.*, vol. i., p. 433. Lord John Russell always denied that Howley made any objection.

§ *D.N.B.*

‖ *Life of S. Wilberforce*, vol. iii., p. 5.

Essays and Reviews the Bishop of Hereford thought "that this was a question between Infidelity and Christianity, and that we ought to prosecute!" Samuel Wilberforce visited Hereford in 1863 and attended the Cathedral. He records in his diary for June 30, "Bishop Hampden preached a dull but thoroughly orthodox sermon." Posterity cannot but endorse the view of W. E. Gladstone expressed in a letter to his father dated February 2, 1848, in which he declares of the whole Hampden affair that "never was a firebrand more wantonly and gratuitously cast."*

Samuel Wilberforce was probably the most famous and forceful prelate of the last century. Was it because of his share in the Hampden Controversy that he was not translated to Canterbury? He was one of the thirteen signatories to the solemn Episcopal Remonstrance addressed to the Prime Minister. On December 12, 1847, he wrote, "It is painful to me to feel how probable it is that it will cost me that kindly trust of the Queen which has no end, but for itself."† The Queen and certainly the Prince Albert could not be expected to be amiably disposed towards those who had dared oppose a Crown appointment, particularly as the candidate in question held religious views similar to their own. "I believe myself," wrote Samuel to his brother Robert, in January 1848, "to have given up all that men call worldly promotion when I signed the Remonstrance against Hampden."‡ In later years, however, it would appear from a conversation between the Prince and Lord Aberdeen that the astute consort of the Queen had, rightly or wrongly, come to be suspicious "as to the Bishop's sincerity and disinterestedness,"§ and instanced the Bishop's eagerness to become the preceptor of the young Prince Edward and also alleged that the Bishop has accommodated his views about "a certain miracle" to suit those of his own. Be that as it may, Wilberforce was clearly sincere in his opposition to the Hampden appointment. A number of clergy in the Oxford diocese petitioned the Bishop to grant them "Letters of Request" for a suit to be instituted in the Court of Arches by which Hampden might be tried for heresy. Hampden, as vicar of Ewelme, was beneficed in the Oxford diocese, and the Bishop before granting the "Letters of Request" approached Hampden urging him to make a further declaration of orthodoxy. The Professor, however, refused to come to terms in any way, and the Bishop in the meantime studied afresh the "Bampton Lectures" and Newman's "Elucidations." The effect was to cause the

* Morley, *Life of Gladstone* (1912), vol. i., p. 280.
† *Op. cit.*, vol. i., p. 445.
‡ *Op. cit.*, vol. i., p. 496.
§ *Op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 275.

Bishop to change his mind about Hampden and to withdraw the "Letters of Request" which he had granted. "I came to the conclusion," he wrote to his brother, "that there was no heresy in them [the Bampton Lectures]; that every article would fail [*i.e.*, in the Court of Arches]; that Newman's extracts were most false—I hope not wickedly and intentionally so . . . I hope Henry [Bishop Phillpotts of Exeter] won't cut me."* The latter was certainly indignant at his episcopal brother's change of mind and wrote to him deploring the lack of "judicial discretion which I should have anticipated in you beyond almost any other of my brethren."† To Dr. Hampden the Bishop wrote: "I applied myself to a thorough and impartial examination of the 'Bampton Lectures.' I have now carefully studied them throughout, with the aid of those explanations of their meaning which you have furnished to the public since their first publication, and now in your private publications. The result of this examination, I am bound plainly to declare, is my own conviction that they do not justly warrant those suspicions of unsoundness to which they have given rise, and which, so long as I trusted selected extracts, I myself shared."‡

Wilberforce was widely attacked for his change of front. So widely was it alleged that he had veered round for worldly reasons that the Bishop actually contemplated explaining his position in an "Open Letter to a Friend" to be addressed to Sir Robert Peel. The latter, however, advised against its publication, stating that its appearance would give the impression that the Bishop's attitude needed justification. Although Wilberforce was eventually translated to Winchester, it is significant that on the death of Sumner, C. T. Longley (who had not signed the Remonstrance against Hampden's appointment) was translated from York to succeed Sumner at Canterbury. Again, on Longley's death, A. C. Tait, who had defended Hampden, was translated from London. Other reasons may explain why Wilberforce was passed over, as, for instance, that he was a High Churchman, albeit of the old school, and that so many of his nearest and dearest had entered the Roman Church. Be that as it may, Wilberforce has been so often pictured as a wily prelate with his eye always on the main chance (hence the nickname "Soapy Sam") that the fact that he did, if only for a time, oppose a Crown appointment is of some interest.

W. E. Gladstone as the years passed by became more and more conscious of the injustice that had been done to Hampden. As an undergraduate he had been examined in science by Dr.

* *Op. cit.*, vol. i., p. 494.
† *Op. cit.*, vol. i., p. 489.
‡ *Op. cit.*, vol. i., p. 486.

Hampden as early as 1831. Although he had taken no active part in the turmoil of 1836 Gladstone felt constrained in 1856 to address the following letter to the Bishop of Hereford:

HAWARDEN,
CHESTER.
November 9, 1856.

My Lord Bishop,

Your Lordship will probably be surprised at receiving a letter from me, as a stranger. The simple purpose of it is to discharge a debt of the smallest possible importance to you, yet due I think from me, by expressing the regret with which I now look back in my concurrence in a vote of the University of Oxford in the year 1836 condemnatory of some of your Lordship's publications. I did not take actual part in the vote; but upon reference to a journal kept at the time, I find that my absence was owing to an accident.

For a good many years past I have found myself ill able to master books of an abstract character, and I am far from pretending to be competent at this time to form a judgment on the merits of any propositions then at issue. I have learned, indeed, that many things which, in the forward precipitancy of my youth, I should have condemned, are either in reality sound, or lie within the just limits of such discussion as specially befits an University.

The letter continues with a reference to his own opposition to the expulsion of F. D. Maurice from a Chair in King's College, London, in 1853, and concludes:

It was only, as I have said, after mature reflection that I came to perceive the bearing of the case on that of 1836, and to find that by my resistance I had condemned myself and I then lamented very sincerely that I had not on that occasion, now so remote, felt and acted in a different manner.

I beg your Lordship to accept this my expression of my cordial regret, and to allow me to subscribe myself, very respectfully,

Your obedient and humble servant,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

It speaks well for the bishop's breadth of mind that he made no attempt to make capital out of this letter which was published for the first time in 1871, several years after his death, in his daughter Henrietta's *Memorials of Bishop Hampden.*

The Tractarians reaped a bitter and lasting harvest for their share in the troubles of 1836. Serious opposition to the Tractarian movement dates from that year. While this had its effect in solidifying the movement, the major consequence was that Tractarianism so far from remaining, to use Newman's phrase, "a spirit afloat" destined to captivate the whole Anglican world, became merely a party within the Church. For the first time the charge of Romanizing was seriously made against the Tractarians, with dire results. The teaching of the movement was ridiculed in a pamphlet which was a parody of Newman's "Elucidations." Charles Dickinson, later Bishop of Meath, published an anonymous "Pastoral Epistle from His Holiness the Pope to Some Members of the University of Oxford." April 1836 saw the publication of a fierce article by Thomas Arnold in the *Edinburgh Review* entitled "The Oxford Malignants"—a mild title for its contents. In the article, which nearly cost him the headmastership of Rugby, Arnold speaks of the Tractarians as "formalist judaizing fanatics who have ever been the peculiar disgrace of the Church of England." He goes on to compare them to Hickes the Non-Juror because of the "pretended holiness of his life," asserting that he "found his religion perfectly compatible with falsehood and malignity." Arnold's article brought to the surface all the fears that had been simmering in the subconscious minds of Churchmen and in particular the fear of Rome. So it is that Dean Church dates to the publication of that article the beginning of that unpopularity of the movement which has lasted to this day, a hundred years since. Renn Dickson Hampden, the unwitting cause of it all, died on April 23, 1868, at 107 Eaton Place, and was buried at Kensal Green Cemetery.

W. J. Cratchley.

THE KINGDOM AND THE WORLD

The idea of the Kingdom of God occupies an important place in the teaching of Jesus. New Testament scholars have now for some time been aware that in the mind of Jesus the idea of the Kingdom was a *religious* conception; yet most ordinary Christians (including most preachers) have long been in the habit of speaking of "the Kingdom" in the sense of a social rather than a religious idea. They have pictured the Kingdom as the ideal of the perfect order of society upon the earth, in which God's will is done through political, educational, or legislative institutions, as it is in heaven. Even in the

disillusionment of the present decade Christian people do not generally question whether such a view of the Kingdom bears any relation to Jesus' view of it; they have merely been seized by a doubt as to whether this ideal of a perfect society is as easily realizable as had formerly been imagined. It is still widely assumed that one of the functions of the Church or of Christianity in the world is to promote the coming of the Kingdom in the sense of this ideal society. It is, in England at any rate, uncritically assumed that the Church has a social function to perform—namely, to work for the establishment of the Kingdom of God upon the earth as an outward social organization which embodies those great principles of justice and love which the Church's Gospel includes.

Such a confusion of the purely religious idea of the Kingdom as taught by Jesus (and in the New Testament generally) with the modern social idea of the Kingdom as the ideal society upon the earth has created a great deal of perplexity and ineffectiveness. Devout inquirers have been puzzled as to what Jesus could have meant when He taught that the Kingdom is *given* as the gift of God to men: quite obviously the condition of the modern world does not lead us to the belief that God gives the ideal society to mankind as a gift; while to belittle the necessity of human effort, at the instigation of a theology which asserts that the Kingdom, when it comes, will be God's gift to men, would merely tend to deprive the forces which are moulding the world of the next decade of all Christian inspiration and leadership. If we regard the Kingdom as being the gift of God to men (which was undoubtedly the view taken by Jesus) and also as the ideal society of brotherhood, justice and peace, to be established on the earth, then it is clear that we tend to deprive of all moral worth human efforts after betterment, since it will plainly be man's duty to wait with patience for God's gift to come, and not foolishly to imagine that he can either force the hand of God or assist in the giving of the gift. Thus, religion is turned into that kind of pietism which cuts the nerve of moral endeavour.

But, on the other hand, it is equally unsatisfactory to deny that the Kingdom is the gift of God, because the liberal kind of secularized religion has been generally proved defective in an age of crisis. Those who forsook the throne of grace in order to worship in the temple of humanity are finding it increasingly difficult to believe that the ideal society—God's will on earth—will come by human striving.

Finding it impossible to accept in an unmodified form either of these views—either that God " gives " to men the ideal society or that men " build " it for themselves—many Christians

today try to take what seems to them to be an English compromise between what they believe to be Barthian transcendentalism and American humanism. (They have probably always believed that the truth lay somewhere between the exaggerations of Augustine and the understatements of Pelagius!) Hence, a compromising position is reached: God gives the Kingdom to men in so far as men will work to prepare a way for its coming.

Such a view is probably the commonest view in England amongst preachers and ordinary Christian folk. Yet it is deplorably inadequate when viewed from either the theological or the sociological standpoint. Taken as a serious answer to the question which is before us, it is a worthless substitute either for the religious realism of Jesus or for the social realism of, say, Karl Marx. On the one hand it destroys the classical Christian conception of the " given " element in religion, because it makes God's gift conditional upon what men do, or feel, or want. The Kingdom is given in so far as *men* do this or that. *Gratia* has, in fact, lost its principal character of being *gratis*. But, on the other hand, such an answer introduces sentimentalism into the Christian outlook upon social issues. It suggests that a kingdom of brotherhood and social justice can in fact be attained on the earth by the immediate application of Christian principles in everyday living. Thus, the preacher goes on saying that if everyone would love his neighbour as himself, the Kingdom or ideal society would automatically come. Of course it would!—but the tragedy which sentimentalism obscures consists in the fact that no man ever has loved or ever will love his neighbour as himself. Even while he is preaching, the sentimentalist is undoubtedly injuring—through the various social and economic complexities over which he has very slight control and of which he has very little knowledge—a great number of neighbours and potential neighbours all over the world. It is no use saying that if we all lived up to the ideal, then the ideal would be realized, because even the best of us is a sinner and incapable of living up to the ideal: a realistic doctrine of man (such as was general in Christianity before the rise of liberalism) will lead us to see that an ounce of political realism will do more for oppressed neighbours than a ton of Christian sentimentalism. The Christian realist who is in earnest about society will not allow a sentimental appeal to what man ought to be to interfere with his radical action in the light of what man is.

The attempt to describe the Kingdom in social terms has in fact proved an utter failure. On the one hand, God never " gives " to man an ideal social order, however anxious

Christians (and others) are that He should do so. On the other hand, men cannot build their own ideal society by the simple application of Gospel principles to the world of business, economics and politics. Is then the idea of the Kingdom of God completely irrelevant and worthless in the modern world ? The answer is quite certainly " Yes "—so long as our idea of the Kingdom remains that of a perfect order of society. Such a conception of the Kingdom leads through idealism to Utopianism, which is sentimentality. The confusion of social Utopianism (as in nineteenth-century liberalism) with the religious hope at one and the same time secularizes religion and yet makes it a narcotic whereby men's legitimate hopes are diverted from the real world and driven into an abstract kingdom of charity and justice, which takes no account of human nature as it is.

But the Kingdom about which Jesus spoke was a religious, not a social conception. It was not an order of society which one entered (not even a church); it was not a splendid Utopia, a coming Messianic age, waiting to be revealed. Indeed it was not a future world at all—whether revolutionary or catastrophic; it was a present reality: the Messianic age had come with its Messiah. Nor was the Kingdom merely a tendency towards social righteousness ever present in the world, with which one was to identify oneself. It was a religious, not a social reality. It was not (save perhaps by way of consequence) connected with social issues at all; in fact, it was not of this world. It was the irruption of a wholly other order into this world, never a sanctification of tendencies or forces already in it. There is no sanction at all in the teaching of Jesus for the confusion of the religious idea of the Kingdom with the social optimism of the modern world; in fact, Jesus made the sharpest possible separation between the things that belong to Cæsar and those which belong to God. Religious men may, perhaps must, take part in the conflict of social values, but religion itself—even that of the author of the Sermon on the Mount—dictates no social or political principles which are immediately applicable to society and its problems.

The recognition of this principle would go far towards the removal of that sentimentalism which is the hampering (and sheltering) burden on the backs of those Christian people who are today genuinely interested in social issues. Sentimentality is their snail's shell which at once prevents any radical activity and provides a comfortable retreat for their sensitive consciences. Such sentimentality is organized around an unhistoric conception of the Kingdom as an order of society and of the law of the Kingdom as being a principle which must determine

activity in the actual world of social and political struggle. It leads, for example, to the substitution of an ineffective religious pacifism for any radical policy of social action such as would logically be involved in the admission that all wars are class wars. Such sentimentalism gives point to the Marxist criticism of religion as " opium," yet it remains as the dominant attitude of Christians of nearly every school of thought in the present decade.

A fresh appreciation of the significance of Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom of God as a religious and not a sociological idea will lead us to see that the charge of sentimentalism or Utopianism cannot be fairly levelled against the central figure of our religion, even though it may be brought against those who call themselves His followers today. A return to the teaching of Jesus would open the way for a new attitude of political realism within the church of the twentieth century; that is why a book like Professor C. H. Dodd's *Parables of the Kingdom** is not a mere academic study to be read by theologians and historians, but is indeed the prolegomena to any consideration of Christian social attitudes in the modern world. Such a book, which investigates Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom with the aid of every resource of modern critical scholarship, should be read by every Christian who is interested in society and its problems—should be read along with the study of Christian ethics from the point of view of modern political realism, such as we find in Professor Reinhold Niebuhr's last book, *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*.†

ALAN RICHARDSON.

THE HOLY COMMUNION: TEACHING THE SACRIFICE ‡

WE all find it extraordinarily difficult to teach effectively the Christian doctrine of Sacrifice. We know we have failed to do so when we see such small signs of response in the daily lives of our people, and we suspect we are going to fail when we do not succeed in getting them to attend and love the Lord's Own Service which to us, at least, speaks so eloquently of this. My theme today is that we may find the answer to our question, " How am I to teach the Sacrifice ?" primarily by considering the manner in which we present the Lord's Supper to His people. The Mass is the characteristic form of Christian

* Nisbet. † S.C.M. Press.
‡ A paper given to the Worcester Priest's Circle.

Worship, and public worship is, as a teacher might call it, the " expression work " of the church. If we have learnt our lesson well as good children should, then our " expression work " will be good.

We have been hearing a good deal lately of the Liturgical Movement in the Roman Church, which says " Back to the words of the Mass." Our movement of revival in the Church of England has largely been a liturgical one; perhaps if it had been more completely so we might have been more successful; yet our enemy has been ambiguity rather than heresy, and because of this, the cry " Back to the Prayer Book " has been responded to half-heartedly. Rome's difficulties are not always ours and we must face our own in the light of our own history, avoiding those " Catholic dream-worlds " so beloved of our Romanticist (*vide* Brillioth) spiritual forbears. Yet what happens in our Liturgy is of supreme teaching importance, and if custom (or self-will) allows us to " farce," let the additions and renovations be also such as teach.

It is said that our trouble today comes from the fact that people do not know their Bibles, *i.e.* that the Evangelical Movement, the parent of so many later, unexpected streams of thought and activity, is played out. This is said to be due to the reaction of the common people to Biblical criticism; they, being at first uneasy that the Bible was not true, are now assured that it is irrelevant. Isn't it truer to say the Bible has always been read in the light of some philosophy, usually taken from itself ? The common philosophy of today is Humanism, and as the Bible has so often been wrested to expound Puritanism, the reaction is from that rather than from the book itself. Again, Humanism, like so many other heresies, is only untrue when taken out of its context with other revealed truth. To put it back into its context is to restore the Catholic doctrine of Humanity, Sacrifice and Redemption—to teach the Bible anew.

The Bible is a book of Sacrifice. The Old Testament like the Ancient World in general reeked with odours of burning sacrifices. The New Testament tells of the Perfect Oblation which makes nonsense of, or at least takes the significance from, all the others. To know that is to go far towards knowing the Bible. We may ask did the " Catacomber " or the early mediæval churchman " know his Bible "? Would he have welcomed a Victorian Sunday School to teach it to him ? Yet they certainly understood Sacrifice. They understood it from the Mass. For there was little else to help save the examples of the saints and martyrs. Good pictures and sculptures and glass were much rarer and more crude than we often think.

The average mediæval probably knew little more " scripture " than the " fifteen mysteries " of Redemption, plus the creation and damnation. He was stronger on the latter than we! The clerks knew more, but then to be a clerk was to be of a different order of being altogether (as with us). One has a suspicion that the problem of teaching has existed before, and in at least one age a certain measure of success was attained without the resources of our days. This was the age, moreover, of the fact of Christendom, that wondrous vision of the world at the feet of Christ. To it the Mass was its Bible; what was not related in its course remained very largely unknown.

Having once sat at the feet of Dr. Coulton, may I hasten to disclaim any desire to idealize this period. But let us be fair—a " working theism " which believes in making the best and giving it to God, whilst admitting its own unworthiness even to do that and its consequent need to " offer Christ," is not a bad beginning for one's religion. Perhaps we teach too many unrelated things and so fail at most of them. Moreover, the Mass really was a corporate act in those days. Hard headed (and handed) business men paid a priest to do this primarily important work for them. The guilds were not sentimental societies, and we know that the Coronation Service was but one example of many things done, and hallowed by being done, during the progress of a Mass. They built their churches and chapels because they needed them for the Mass to be said in, and not primarily either to " witness to their conception of God," or to show how clever they were becoming at architecture.

Every schoolboy knows that the Reformation gave the Bible in the vernacular to the people—although most of them couldn't read it themselves. For this achievement of Renascent learning one can have nothing but thanksgiving today. But the new food took some digesting. Those who could read made their mark by giving one theory or another to expound by. The common people, like the Ethiopian, felt the need of " some man to guide," for they sat at the feet of all kinds of teachers, and were well kicked by some.

Nationalism and Wars of Religion and schism and banking or usury were justified at this time, and, above all, the Individual arrived. From now on he looms large, even in the Catholic Counter-Reformation, and has found a permanent place in the scheme of things. Perhaps in Individual Worth and Personal Piety we have something which was largely a closed book to our ancestors. Yet men always seem to go from one extreme to another, and today his other name is " Pride," his function to be degraded to serfdom.

Nevertheless, we should be ready to learn from the political philosophies of our own time which hold that Individualism is a nuisance. It is becoming hackneyed to mention these by name, and perhaps the present socialistic swing is but an antithesis which some day will subside into a better synthesis. Yet the lesson is clear. You can have too much of a good thing, and too much " Individual " is a nuisance in religion as well as in politics. I cannot pursue the fascinating subject of freedom which is really germane to the subject of sacrifice, beyond pointing out the readiness of many misguided people to live and die for an anti-christ, the modern " State fiction." We are asked in this diocese in this Coronation year at least to say, " I stand for a Christian England." Surely we can only do so effectively when a like fervour to that of the totalitarians is shewn by us for the totalitarian claims of Christ, involving the discipline of His Church. How different might have been the history of the last four centuries if only the Mass had been more used and properly expounded. The " man " who " should guide " is none other than Christ in His Perfect Oblation. Here is the key to our practice—our " theory of life."

This brings me to the " practical " part of my paper, and my first point is concerned with general teaching today. We must *have* the Mass and *use* it. We must see it to contain all the " values " of the Christian Religion. For teaching it contains not only the centre, but also the circumference. Even the other sacraments have little meaning apart from it. Such subjects as Prayer, private and public, Evangelism, Morality, Religion and Life (war, business, wages, healing, etc.) are best taught in connection with it. I have long thought it should be possible to produce a simple Mass book which should help people to realize the *width* of the efficacy of Christ's offering, somewhat on the lines of the relevant part of C. Binyon's *Prayers for the City of God* (Longmans).

Then, must we use long words ? The doctrine, or rather the heart of it, is quite simple and becomes more so with practice. Christ gave Himself completely to His Father. This perfectly dedicated will was possible *because* of His complete unity (by the Holy Spirit) with His Father.

The thought of Who He Is reveals the Wonder of the Thing, both alike and different from man's poor attempts. The Church sees His act as an eternal or perpetual or constant one, and at the Eucharist we are taken up to Heaven to His presence —where He is offering now. By Communion man is taken up to God, rather than God brought down to man.

And we must offer ourselves, and our work, symbolized by the bread and wine or by our money. But this has no value

in itself apart from Christ's offering. In fact—seen *against* the background of Christ's perfect work we ought to know beforehand that much of our work must be rejected. Does our Society reflect God's Will as Christ did ? Do we individually ? The trouble with most modern life is that not only is it not fit to offer, but also we are not doing anything to make it so. It *should* reflect God's will. If it does we are seeing Christ's Redemptive Offering at work. There is, of course, much more than this to be said, but let us rack our brains for synonyms for the Latinisms we so often use, and teach one thing at a time. By the way, I suspect the Anglo-Saxon " worthship " or " worship " was an early attempt to do this. Also, as life is short, let us have the more important things, the " manly " things, first.

Next, the Mass is a corporate act, and is done with assistants for that reason. As incense symbolizes offering, so " censing persons and things " shews all have a share in that offering. The use of the salutation has the same significance. Do we bother to explain what we say and do nowadays as used to be the custom thirty years ago ? Again, since communicating attendance is best, why not arrange for it ? The teaching value of such will be great to the unconfirmed, and to the children especially. Non-communicating attendance is permissible of course, but it is obviously a second best and life is too short to fight for " second bests." Besides, we communicate that we may offer the better.

Nowadays the anti-social activities of choirs and organists are usually curtailed, and we sing many hymns. Those in the " Communion " section of our hymn books can be supplemented by others which will help to bring home the great scheme of universal redemption. The Mass is the Worship of Almighty God through the Son by the power of the Spirit, and the hymns should illustrate that great truth. Also you can have too many; and they should be related either to the Intention of the Mass or to what is being done at the moment. Perhaps the best hymns have yet to be written.

And now to touch upon some more controversial subjects. The first is that of Liturgical Reform. Obviously the service we use will either help or hinder the ideas we are trying to teach. Everyone knows our office was arranged as a compromise, and I daresay that in the days when theological animosities often ended in beheading or burning, a " modus vivendi " must, literally, have appeared to be the truth—if only a pragmatic truth. But pragmatism is always " dated," and now that we have moved to a new conception of toleration, whereby we humbly look to see if the other side has something to teach us, the old formularies

by which the theologians cancelled one another out (and the simple got their calculations wrong) will not serve this age. A new Communion Service is long overdue. The 1928 book's service, in spite of obvious merits, smelt too much of the legal compromise for which it was designed. Eclectic missals are produced to meet a real need, but lack authority. The new service must be simple in language—the English language—and wide in its scope. Its theology must express all the possible affirmations of the ages, avoiding negations like the plague. There will be few rubrics and those will not be in the nature of handcuffs to bind us down. It would be easily recognizable as the successor of the old service we have been obliged to promise to use, not only for that reason, but also because so very many of its phrases are the best that could be used. At the same time we could learn from the old Latin service several things: its directness of statement, its brevity, and that general sense of the emphasis being upon what God in Christ has done rather than upon our poor efforts. I'm sure we all feel we could sit down and compile such a service. The fun would begin when we compared notes. Why don't the bishops offer a prize for the best effort as the newspapers do? Say, a fat living as first prize—there might be worse ways of filling such.

The next controversial question is that of what are called "extra liturgical devotions." Some stiffen at once at the mention of such newfangledness. Yet in the Latin Church they have a considerable history, and are claimed to have done actually what our Reformers set out to do, *i.e.* "turn the Mass into a Communion." In essence they may be considered as an evening commemoration of the morning sacrifice. Both hymns commonly used and the collect make that clear. Few of us have Reservation and so the subject may seem remote.

But whether there is Reservation or no, and the idea is by no means new, there should frequently be an evening commemoration of Communion if we wish for more and better Communicants. We are quite used to the idea of a corporate preparation, so why not a corporate thanksgiving? It should be a definite, self-contained little service and might be used from time to time, rather like the "vesper verse," or the more orthodox "memorials" after Vespers in the old office. Its use would both act as an advertisement for Holy Communion, as Christ Himself is "placarded" before men in all His attractiveness there, and also stir the consciences of those who were absent in the morning.

Another controversial question which must be dealt with soon is the reform or supersession of the Church Catechism. Schoolmasters even find it hard to teach, and pupils to learn.

There are some grand things in it of course, but apart from its tendency to present its dainties in large helpings, there is the incubus of those commandments which are not literally true and have to be explained away. The section on the sacraments comes as an after-thought; there should be a simple section on the sacramental principle much earlier to help children to understand the Mass, and so learn by doing. The New Covenant, ethical and dogmatic teaching, and the practice of prayer could then all be demonstrated from the Mass. Thus, the Lord's Prayer rightly epitomizes the Oblation. All the "parts" of prayer, adoration, thanksgiving, confession, intercession and petition, are there. The worst understood element in prayer, intercession, is rightly seen in its setting as the holding up to the Father's Will for judgment or fulfilment of all the topics and people for whom we pray. In short, intercessory prayer is sacrificial; but then so is all prayer. More and more we miss what is *omitted* from the Catechism. Some use a lesson book like Newland-Smith's, which dexterously expands the given matter. Others look on the Catechism as an important document giving the standard of the Church of England, and proceed to use some other, such as that done by the E.C.U. and S.P.C.K. Others again, "just tell the children an improving story," and they all like it immensely. The catechetical method has long been given up except in teaching religion, but there does seem a need for short, definite statements to be learned by heart.

This paper has implied a certain discontent with things as they are. This is a sign of youth perhaps, but if discontent leads on to repentance it is a good sign. We cannot get what we need without continuous application. In the meantime we have to go on using such means as are at our disposal, and it is here we may remember that possibly the best method used by our forefathers and by our own spiritual pastors and masters was the example of their own life of sacrifice. We have to shew the width of application of the power of Christ's redemption, the whole world waiting to be offered, but it is not a bad thing to begin, as with charity, at home. People on holidays crowd to see the newest abbey and at other times to hear a religious preach. There are other signs, too, that the attraction of the completely dedicated or surrendered life still has power. It is a pity the common mind uses the word "sacrifice" in connection with the heroic. If crowds do not flock to hear us, it is profitable to remember that real sacrifice also implies quietly going on "living to the Lord."

L. E. H. Pike.

GIVE A POOR DOG A BONE

FEW people love Theologians; but of all Theologians the least beloved is the Student of Religions by the Comparative Method. Not only does the recent growth of this branch of Theology cause dislike; the thing is also under suspicion for what it is in itself. "I hear you go in for Comparative Religion," said the M.U. Speaker to the Vicar in her most disapproving tone. "I do hope you still believe in the Incarnation!" And so Professorships and Lectureships for this study are few and far between, and it is left to daring Free Churchmen, or remote Rural Incumbents whom nobody minds, to carry on with their many disadvantages what is admitted in theory to be a true branch of the Queen of the Sciences.

We cannot, indeed, deny that some have expected to find in this study a weapon against the Faith. *The Golden Bough* is not the work of a Christian, and it is said that the Russian Government in its zeal against the Church has founded Chairs of Comparative Religion in its Universities. It was assumed in some quarters that, because a particular feature of Christian belief or practice appeared in another Religion, the whole of our Faith was thereby discredited. But such hasty conclusions really sprang from the old arrogant contention of Christians, based on ignorance, that the Faith alone was true, and all other forms of Religion false. Others have supposed that, because Religion in general began in a very humble way among primitive savages who often did very dreadful things in the name of their gods, Christianity in particular is untrue, and ought to be rejected. But these same objectors would promptly lose their tempers if anyone were so rude as to point out that Modern Science has sprung from equally low origins in Magic. We cannot choose our ancestors in Religion any more than in other spheres of life, and if this kind of argument is the best use to which opponents of the Faith can put Comparative Religion they will not do much harm. The fact is, that we have all been scared by the weighty names of the Students of Comparative Religion into a fear of the subject of their studies, when all the time our proper course was to have met them on their own ground and shewn them their mistakes.

What, then, is the value of Comparative Religion to a Christian?

First, it is necessary to Missionary Work. The pioneers of modern Missions had, indeed, to go to their fields of labour without any knowledge of the Religions which they would

find there. And everyone will agree that it is the business of a Missionary to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ Our Saviour before all else. But the knowledge now available of the many Religions of the world, ancient and modern, will help the Missionary to avoid some serious mistakes. He can now be, if he will, in a position to value and admire wherever he finds truth and goodness, and the strength of his fairness will draw the best among the Heathen to listen to his message. Equipped with a large knowledge of the history of the Religion of the people among whom he works, the Missionary will be the better able to find terms in their language for ideas of our Faith, which will have the right associations for those who are learning them. By this means many heresies will be avoided. When he finds that the Religion of his people has made much of some special idea of the Godhead, or has cultivated some particular ideal of moral life, the instructed Missionary will be able to arrange his message to suit his hearers. Preaching the Gospel is, indeed, the same everywhere, in that it is the proclamation of Salvation in Jesus Christ; but the preaching ought not always to begin in the same way. There is a proper difference of approach to Chinese, to Hindus, to the peoples of the Lower Culture, to Moslems, because of the difference of historic background in the case of each Religion; and here the Comparative Study of Religion comes to its own.

Secondly, Comparative Religion, especially in so far as it deals with Primitive Religions and their deposits in Folk-Lore, is often of use to parish priests. Popular Religion is always a danger, for it runs back into ideas and ideals which are far removed from the Cross. If the Church is to direct it into harmless channels, her ministers must be well acquainted with the sources of it, and able to decide what in it is good and what bad. Rural Clergy in particular have constantly to cope with survivals of Nature Worship and with superstitions which begin far back in the very dawn of the race. Mere denial and resistance will not kill them, and repressed Nature Worship may very easily issue in horrid results. On the other hand, simple antagonism may kill too much. It might be argued, for example, that the Methodism of the last century in its very proper war upon rural superstition went far towards killing the germ of the sacramental idea among rustics. A fuller and more ordered knowledge may sometimes make for a wise treatment of these non-Christian elements in English Religion which will lead our people on towards the Catholic Faith.

Thirdly, the Comparative Study of Religions will help to

elucidate many Old Testament problems. Sir J. G. Frazer has given us a start in this direction; but his instances are concerned only with Folk-Lore, and in general the Old Testament writers had passed a long way beyond the range of this elementary form of philosophy. A knowledge of the Religions of China, ancient Mexico and Peru, Egypt, Persia, Babylon, and Greece, is more likely to supply help with Old Testament problems, over and above the possibility of our finding dependence in some cases on the Babylonian and Persian systems. Indeed, it is where we can trace parallel developments, and not dependence, that students of Comparative Religions are most interested, for dependence may cut both ways and the evidence seldom amounts to conviction. New Testament Scholars also, if they do not run down blind alleys such as that of the Mystery Religions, may get some help from the Comparative Study, especially from those who know much of Buddhism and the other Higher Religions; though the main gain to Biblical Scholarship will probably be at the lower level of the Old Testament.

And fourthly, Comparative Religion has a contribution to make to the Philosophy of Religion. Most workers in this field do at least a lip service to the Study; but few are as yet really at home in the published literature of the non-Christian Religions, and the force of their conclusions is thereby dissipated. Yet a valid Philosophy of Religion must take account of religious life and experience in all its manifold variety, and there must be an adequate treatment of the problems which this variety involves. Why did Egyptian Religion make much of the future life, while Hebrew Religion almost ignored it? How does Monist thought enter Religion, and how does this type of philosophy alter religious experience? To answer such questions as these a thinker must work upon the background of a large knowledge of what Religion has been, and is, all over the world. And as the world contracts by rapid and easy transport questions of this sort become more urgent.

No Christian who engages, in however elementary a degree, in this Study will deny his shortcomings. Christian Students of Comparative Religions seldom know enough of Christian Dogmatics; and they are far too ready to take resemblances for identities, and to call things by Christian ecclesiastical names when they are not really like Christian institutions at all. Moreover, it is very difficult to keep our knowledge of the various Systems of Religion advancing at the same pace, and a Christian Student can seldom know another Religion as he knows his own. So the claims of this Study must always be modest. We do not expect to be treated on a level of equality

with the senior Studies in Theology, the Scriptures, Dogmatics, Patristics, Church History, and the Philosophy of Religion. All we claim is to be allowed a place within the Church's family of learning. Might we, please, be promoted from our present chilly quarters in the disused stables across the yard at the least to the warmth of the back-kitchen ?

J. W. Parker.

MISCELLANEA

HOLY COMMUNION OR DIS-UNION ?

Prayer is the most sensitive activity that a soul can indulge in. So sensitive is it that its practice within the confines of the mind or soul is sadly interrupted, hindered, and frustrated, not only by external events, but by the unseen distractions of the mind itself. In corporate worship these things are still to be contended with, plus an additional factor, the Priest. Is this to be of itself another distraction or, if it functions aright, an aid to overcome all distractions both within and without ? One generally finds the partisan priest, whether he be Catholic or Evangelical, is a distraction to the point of driving people away from corporate worship into spiritual isolation, which is only too common today and is referred to as " spiritual independence "! So independent that it does without God Himself. How often does one hear, when calling on the lapsed members of our Communion, " Well, I couldn't hear what he was saying and felt that I'd no part in the service." " Sometimes he sings, sometimes he mutters, and before you know where you are it's all over, and so what's the use of going ?" " I don't want to hear a man talking to himself when I come to Church," etc., etc. These are, of course, exaggerated faults which provided the excuse for a growing indifference, but I feel somehow these very faults were and are the beginnings of such indifference. That same spiritual individualism which has rent the Catholic Church until it is a farce to use the term today may sometimes be seen in the conduct of the " Catholic " priest while he is celebrating. Such a man casts off his Ordination vows, uses his own book (an uncommon book for the purpose of common prayer !), abuses God's gifts of action and speech until he whittles his fellowship down to a congregation which is nothing more or less than clique, rotten with self-righteousness. How can we avoid this ? Surely it is our own fault ? It is foolishness to blame the Liturgy, the rubrics, the Bishops, the " anything-but-me attitude " which is the curse of the Pharisee.

As Priests our job is to satisfy the people's need for God on the one side, and to reveal God's need for them on the other. This is not to say that he is the interceder or in any way a mediator. No man can supplant Jesus, but it is our awesome privilege to be a unifying factor in the activity of corporate prayer. We must be a bridge, not a barrier, realizing to the full that a bridge is made to be walked on. The Altar, not the Priest, is the focus point of two converging lines of Love. The eternal presence of God in Life brought to sacramental reality (and there is nothing more real) in the Body and Blood of Our Lord is one such line, and the other that inward yearning of every soul for kinship with God. The fact of the Priest is a sign of our human frailty. We are those called to cry out " Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord," and, as Our Lord has pointed out, if we did not so cry out the stones would. After all, our God is an Almighty one. This I think is our first need—priestly humility. This will be expressed in his silences, his willingness to say the least, to use the most simple rites, the most common Liturgy, the plainest voice

and above all the power of the Spirit. This last factor is dependent entirely on our self-abasement. So many Priests make it quite clear that they are present that one feels God Himself has had to recede. The Liturgy and the rites enable him to use two gifts—namely, action and voice. These functions will make or mar the "atmosphere" as we term the sensation of worship. The true atmosphere will be the outcome of a right use of these gifts, not on the contents of the thurible. Ostentation of action will destroy any atmosphere. We forget that we are watched both by God and the people. Therefore the less they see of us the better. We are not there to shew people how to pray, but to pray with them. Some men use so many "Lord be with you's" that they introduce an element of doubt into the heart of our spiritual life. The greatest gift we have to use in this action of prayer is the voice. Why is it that so many of us who can and do talk quite nicely to man must needs talk down our nose, or hiss, or mutter, or sing, intone, shout or do anything so long as it is unnatural? Do we forget that the supernatural can be reached only through the natural? This reveals our second point, at all costs let us be natural. All prayer is talking to God, so let us talk in prayer and let the choir sing in praise. God spake the Word, then why do we pass it on to His people on the wings of a nasal G? Both the Epistle and Gospel should be read to the people with a clear voice and good manners. If it is rude to turn one's back when talking about mundane things, how much more rude and wrong is it to do so when talking about the activity of God's love in both His presence and the presence of those whom He loves? After all, God's Word came to the people and for the people, not the East window. We must inspire faith, and that brings us to the last point, we must be faithful. If we begin with disloyalty to our own Liturgy which men can see, how can we expect them to believe in us and through us things they cannot see? Do we act as though we were in the presence of two Lovers? Because that should be our governing thought. As men called to assist in the glory of Love expressed, bringing the Lover and the Beloved together, pleading forgiveness, expressing mercy, encouraging the shy, retarding the ardent; raising the fallen, rebuking the proud, thus building and confirming the faithful on the human side of our work; and on the Divine we must be seen as one in the very Presence, humbly confessing sin as a child to a Father, yet filled with the exultation of one who believes in Jesus and so cries out, "Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord."

S. L. Purches.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE PARABLE OF THE UNJUST STEWARD

Dr. Baverstock's interpretation of this parable is open to a formidable objection. It assumes that the steward cheated his master a second time for his own ends. If so, what sense can be made of the words "the lord commended the unjust steward"? The best that could be done with that phrase would be to assume the defrauded master acknowledged the "canniness" of his bailiff in a colloquial tone: "Upon my word, a shrewd fellow!" Can that stand?

Plummer defends the interpretation by taking the ὅτι in v. 8 as follows: "He was justified in praising him because," or "I cite this example because"—quoting Chrysostom. Trench agrees. Similarly Bruce, Gore, Canon Quick, and several Germans quoted by Bruce. But in every case, a forced and fanciful explanation is given of the employer's commendation.

No answer is forthcoming to the plain question: Why should the employer praise his bailiff for cheating him a second time when the first attempt had been met by a sentence of dismissal? One or two commentators make out that the bailiff cheated not the lord but the tenants. If so, the lord would not have praised him for shrewdness. A shrewd man wishing to curry favour with a group of his fellow men does not go out of his way to swindle them.

Apart from this grave objection I submit that the picture the commentators draw of the employer as a genial man of the world struck with admiration of the bailiff's resourcefulness, would be superfluous and therefore inartistic. If would weaken the main lesson of the story by a side-portrait which at best is irrelevant. Modern novelists and dramatic writers allow themselves to introduce irrelevances or even subordinate plots, because their *main* object is to interest the readers, not to instruct them. Nobody would blame Dickens for the multiplicity of his portraits or Shakespeare for the bringing in of the porter in Macbeth. But the parables in the N.T. are not like that. No details are introduced merely because they are interesting or attractive.*

What then is the explanation of which we are in search? It is simply that the steward deducted from the bills the amount due to himself as wages. That is to say, he sacrificed what was his own instead of defrauding his lord again. The lord on hearing of it—which he naturally would do, though on the traditional assumption it would be very improbable—commended the dishonest man for changing his ways, and not only securing the whole of the rents for his master, but doing so along with a prudent gift or bonus to the tenants; in gratitude for which they would be glad to help him to a lodging for his old age.

I daresay this interpretation has been thought of before, but it certainly is known to very few. If it is adopted, the story gives us a picture of ordinary men behaving, as Canon Quick puts it, "as the product of a faithful observation of natural processes or human action which all may recognise." The practice, too, of underlings collecting in one payment their own wages along with the sum due to their lords must have been familiar from the behaviour of the tax-gatherers.

Moreover the spiritual teaching gains in richness. Our Lord points to the behaviour of a man who in his selfishness is faced with the prospect of ruin. In fear he changes his policy and forgoes the immediate gain, sacrificing it for the sake of his future. The motive is good and the action is good: there is nothing heroic about it, but it is no longer knavish. It might be called enlightened selfishness, worldly no doubt in its aim,

* All details, I think, enforce the central lesson even if they are improbable or unattractive—*e.g.*, the beam in the eye, or the payments made to the labourers in the vineyard. The Prodigal Son *motif* was a warning against the sour, churlish temper which criticizes even the most vivid evidence of the Divine Love in action. The warning is made awful by the brother's temper not being overdrawn, though the odiousness of the picture is enhanced to the utmost by the glory of the description of the Divine Grace transforming a human soul; against which the spectator protests!

but redeemed by the element of sacrifice which is involved in it: and so it deserves the verdict bestowed on it by the master in the story and by our Lord in His measured judgment: "the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light."

Notice also the propriety of the words used. In what respect was the steward *wiser*? In this: that before it was too late he learnt the lesson that common prudence dictated a policy of *sacrifice*: he was consistent when consistency to his principle cost something, whereas it is just there that "the children of light" are found wanting. We know that before us is the Day of Judgment and Eternity. But consistency with that knowledge always involves sacrifice of some sort or another: and it is from sacrifice that we shrink.

So the proposed interpretation records our Lord describing for our imitation a man who acted rightly after acting wrongly. By the traditional interpretation, a strange pattern for imitation indeed is set before us: a man who was pertinacious in wrongdoing to the very end, and foolish too, because he was certain to be found out. Yet in the story that man is commended for wisdom!

There is general agreement that the main lesson is that we have to use our natural gifts with eternity in mind. (The word "faithful" in v. 10 may perhaps be explained by R. M. Benson's saying that faith is concerned with the future. A faithful steward means one who knows that he will be called to account before the Judgment-seat of Christ for his use of that which has been entrusted to him; not his own, but Another's.) The other parable which teaches the same thing is the Ten Virgins. In the N.T. the expression τὰ ὀπίσω, "the things behind," is used to denote the opposite: not the things external but those of the world which is passing away (Mark xiii. 16; Luke ix. 62, xvii. 31; John vi. 66, xx. 14; Phil. iii. 13).

Our Lord's comment on the story begins in the middle of v. 8: "For the children . . ." The following verses soon are blended with utterances gathered from other sources and unconnected with the parable: except the opening, "Make to yourselves friends . . . habitations." A paraphrase is necessary. "You, my hearers, have various 'natural' gifts committed to you to use for the bringing of your fellow men to the knowledge of Me (*e.g.*, money, intellectual power, influence, etc., called the mammon of unrighteousness because they are so often used selfishly), that when they come to an end (when you die) those whom you have laid under your debt may repay you by welcoming you into habitations unlike the frail insecure labourers' cottages (literally, movable tents), for they will be abodes that are eternal. A very beautiful finish!

E. Lyttelton.

Sir,

May I suggest the following interpretation of this parable? The accusation against the steward was one of wastefulness, not of deliberate dishonesty. We may imagine the circumstances to have been somewhat as follows: The steward, while "squeezing" the tenants, had allowed his lord's property to go to rack and ruin, buildings were left unrepaired, fields were not properly cultivated, etc.

It was impossible in the short time at his disposal for the steward to remedy these defects, but he could and did " feather his nest," as we say, by reducing the rents and so making friends with the tenants, and his lord commended him as a clever rogue, who had done the best for himself in very difficult circumstances.

The moral of the parable would then be: You see how clever the men of this world are in making the best of difficult circumstances; imitate, not their roguery, but their prudence and foresight; make the best use you can of the opportunities that remain to you: " redeem the misspent time that's past."

Yours, etc.,
ROGER F. MARKHAM.

AUCHTON RECTORY,
ORMSKIRK, LANCS.
August 5, 1937.

BETWEEN THE CONSECRATION AND COMMUNION

SIR,

There are a number of younger priests who feel a real difficulty with regard to the period in the Eucharist between the consecration and the communion. What prayers should an Anglican priest use at that point ?

The Roman canon is frequently used. In his review of *The Altar Missal* in your July issue, Dr. Lowther Clarke says, " Priests who do this are not conscious of implying that the English Rite is inadequate, nor do they lead their congregations to this conclusion." But in your May issue (p. 294) a writer describes the interpolation of the Roman canon as " a multiplication of crossings and genuflexions which can hardly fail to convey to ordinary folk that the Prayer Book liturgy has not done its work sufficiently."

It would indeed be a serious thing to lead English Church people to think their rite is, not imperfect, but insufficient; for that would at once stamp the Church of England as no part of the Apostolic Society. It is a question of importance therefore which of the two passages quoted from your journal is correct.

Dr. Lowther Clarke finishes his paragraph by saying, " The additions are said privately in order to enrich private devotion." All would agree the priest at the Altar requires a space in which he can make his private devotions; but can the prayers of the Roman canon be so called ? " A multiplication of crossings " is rather a harsh way of describing the sixteen crosses which are made with or over the Sacrament. Yet here is the difficulty, for the sign of the cross is associated in most people's minds with the act of blessing, and the signing of the sacrament must signify a further hallowing of what is already according to our Prayer Book rite the most blessed of all blessings. Are these signings in the Roman canon something other than acts of hallowing ?

Dr. Fortescue writes (*The Mass*, ch. viii., § 6): " The signs of the Cross here and later at the *Per quem hæc omnia* prayer, namely after the words of institution, need cause no difficulty. They are not merely ways of pointing, but are real blessings. As such they again exemplify a common idea. The whole consecration-prayer is one thing, of which the effect

is the change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. During this prayer we ask continually for that grace; although the prayer takes time to say and God grants what we ask at one instant, not necessarily the last instant of the prayer."

If Dr. Fortescue is right then two things are clear. The prayers from *Unde et Memores* to the commixture are not private devotions but an integral part of the consecration prayer of the Roman Church. And, therefore, the layman is correct who imagines the priest to be continuing to perform the act of consecration, and from this he will almost certainly draw the conclusion that the English Prayer of Consecration is inadequate.

What prayers then should the Anglican priest say between the consecration and communion? Only if he is willing to risk leading his congregation to doubt the validity of his orders and of the sacrament he administers will he use the Roman canon. Two precautions seem necessary: (i) The prayers he says must be private. (ii) His actions at this point should be the fewest possible. But private prayers for the priest's use at this point of the service are not easy to come by, and a journal of historic Christianity would do valuable service by inviting priests to collaborate in a search for the most suitable prayers for the most sacred moment of the Eucharist.

L. B. Towner.

St. Michael's Cottage,
Camberley, Surrey.
July 13, 1937.

REVIEW

THE LIFE OF JESUS. By Conrad Noel. J. M. Dent. 12s. 6d.

It is too long, and one side of it is heavier than the other, but it is a very interesting and stimulating book, and, if it is studied in the quarters for which it is probably intended, it will do a great deal of good. We hope that it will be translated into Russian and Chinese. From Red minds which have the patience to read it with care, it will remove the impression that our Lord was merely the benevolent pietist or that Christianity is nothing but dope. Mr. Noel has set himself to examine the life of our Lord in its economic and political environment. This is a task of great importance, because many of the older historians neglected or misunderstood the environment, and there is among Communists a disposition to think of primitive Christianity as an economic, bread-hungry movement of the proletariat. As such it even wins its meed of praise. There is truth in all progressive movements. Bouck White, an American writer to whom Mr. Noel refers with considerable but not unqualified approval, says (we quote from memory a book read ten years ago) something like this: " Wishing to strike at the capitalistic oppression of the Empire, Jesus needed a lever for his purpose, and he found this lever in religion." This is like saying that Shakespeare wanted to express himself, and it occurred to him that thoughts and words would be a good medium for the purpose. Mr. Noel of course knows much better than that. He is, as he says, a son of the Catholic tradition and of its Christology, even though, as he is careful to point out, orthodoxy and conventionality are quite different things, but in this book he hopes to " interest both orthodox and unorthodox alike." His main object is to exhibit the revolutionary character of our Lord's mission and message, and to refute the pietistic, fundamentalist and pacifist heresies, together with various forms of Puritan misinterpretation which have tried to distort the historical facts.

Mr. Noel's method is first of all to shew that not only the Old Testament prophets were messengers of revolt, but that the Old Testament ideal was thoroughly democratic. This is not difficult, and did not really need the two hundred pages which are devoted to it. That Israel was for long a monarchy was accidental and pardonable. " Samuel's out and out republicanism was more in accordance with the ultimate ideal

of the Kingdom of God," but the Hebrew monarchy was not impossible. The Law is analyzed, and special importance is found in the Law of Jubilee, for which it is suggested that kings like Ahab would have the utmost contempt. Mr. Noel would like to believe that such legislation was a survival of "a just primitive custom law . . . common to all mankind or at least to a common ancestry of Babylonians and Hebrews." Apart from the writing prophets, Moses, Elijah, Elisha and Nehemiah are the heroes of this part of the story. When we come to the Gospels the Roman Empire is pilloried as a capitalistic business. The conquest of the world was made for gain, and gain of a modern kind—*i.e.*, not only from direct tribute but from financial profits arising out of private or joint-stock commercial undertakings. Some Jews, like Philo and Josephus, had made terms with Mammon. Not so the Redemptionists, among whom was Mary, "the patriot maid." She "passed on to her boy such Mosaic teaching as the land for the workers, and the anti-usury law, the words of those fiery revolutionaries the prophets, the story of the winning of national independence and of its loss through internal corruption and external conquest." Our Lord Himself was convinced that "the poverty that oppressed his people was an effect rather than a cause, and that the cause lay largely in the Roman occupation." "Riches were the wealth gained at the expense of the workers, and almsgiving was the act of restoring to them what they themselves had produced." The acceptable year of Luke iv. 19 "was either the seventh year fallow, when the whole community were to share the fruits of the earth in common, when all debts were to be cancelled and there was to be a general amnesty; or more probably the year of Jubilee, when, in addition to these generous enactments in favour of the workers and the peasants, the land was to be returned to the original families who held it." "He that hath, to him shall be given" means "To the eager-minded who are alert to learn the mysteries of the new world whose values are in direct opposition to money-grubbing and domination, more knowledge shall be given." The man without a wedding-garment was "utterly lacking in the spirit of comradeship and in courtesy to his host." "Who made me a judge or a divider?" means "My business is with a world where all essential property is held in common, and there will be found to be not only enough, but plenty for all." "Render unto Cæsar" means "Whether you pay these taxes or no is a matter of small importance, the day is soon coming when you will be free from all such burdens."

There is some flogging of pietistic horses which we should have thought were dead. Our Lord teaches that there is

to be a future life, but He is " not primarily interested in the mere permanence of the individual soul after death." " This world and the world to come " commonly means " this covetous epoch and the good time coming," and it is rather oddly said that " it is the comfortable, the compromisers, the people who are doing very nicely upon this earth and ' making their bit ' out of the present system, who fix their hopes on ' heaven,' and not the people who are in desperate revolt against the present order as were the Apocalyptists against the world of their day." The fact is that the book is tendencious. It is an interpretation which has picked out and underlined everything which is most congenial to itself. It is written with one eye on the Russian revolution. The man who pulled down his barns to build greater is a " Kulak." The Great Assize is a contrast of those nations which have established a system by which the hungry are fed and those nations which have not. Had it not been for Constantine and the betrayal of the holy cause, " if the Church had remained true to her Lord and His commonwealth, men and women would not have been driven into atheism, nor would those discords of bitterness and hatred have marred the splendid achievements of the French and Russian revolutions. But in spite of these jarring notes, the miraculous uprising of the Russian peoples from bondage and despair has not only within it large elements of that early Christian renaissance, but has achieved, through the wisdom and courage of its leaders, and countless other participants, so amazing a triumph that it is a matter for shame that Christians will not generally admit its glorious record. If Russia will not, or is not for the moment, through our own sins, able to recognize God as the source and inspiration of their creative efforts, God recognizes them as among those other sheep whom His Son has, and who, in so far as they are doing His Will, belong to the one fold and the one Shepherd."

One-sided ? Omitting much of another kind that might have been said ? Yes. But so eager, so generous, and to many readers so novel an interpretation that it is a real addition to the literature of the Gospels. The scholarship is not quite unimpeachable, and some of the authorities quoted are rather old-fashioned, but the book contains the fruits of wide reading and devoted labour. May it prove, in St. Paul's words, that " to whom He was not spoken of, they shall see: and they that have not heard shall understand."

S. C. Carpenter.

NOTICES

Contemporary Indian Philosophy. Edited by Professors S. Radhakrishna and J. H. Muirhead. George Allen and Unwin. 16s.

Contemporary Indian Philosophy is a very remarkable and important book. It consists of essays by fourteen leading Indian philosophers—if we may include Mahatma Gandhi and Sir Rabindranath Tagore in that category. Each has tried to give, in brief and summary form, the essence of his own belief, and the line of thought which has led him to it. A few of the essays have prefixed to them short and illuminating biographies of their writers. They differ very widely from each other, both in style and in matter. Some are lucid, some are obscure; that of Sir Rabindranath Tagore is an exquisite meditation rather than a philosophical disquisition. Sometimes we find ourselves reading pages which might have been penned by a modern Christian thinker; sometimes we have an able restatement of the orthodox Vedantist position.

In all, however, we note one outstanding feature. Every writer has studied, deeply and appreciatively, European philosophy, from Heraclitus and Plato to Croce and Bergson. Even where their attitude is critical, they have taken the great Western systems of thought fully into account. Some writers appear to regard themselves as followers of their European predecessors rather than of their ancestral teachers, but at the same time, consciously or unconsciously, all have built their spiritual life and thought upon their Indian heritage. No Christian reader can study this book without looking forward eagerly to the time when a Christian India shall absorb and interpret, in high idealistic spirit, the meaning of Jesus for the human mind. We feel more strongly than ever that a final statement of Christian metaphysical theology can ultimately come only from India.

T. H. Robinson.

Saul. By Josef Wenter. Translated by R. E. A. Howe. Rich and Cowan. 8s. 6d.

The ancient world is a fruitful field for modern novelists, but few of them have paid attention to the people of Israel. Perhaps the reason is that Israel is Biblical and therefore religious and therefore dull! This book should be sufficient contradiction of any such idea. The story is both a stirring and a tragic one, and Herr Wenter has made it live. All may not agree with his interpretation of the characters of Saul and David, but they will be driven back to their Bibles to discover why.

E. L. Mascall.

Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System. By G. R. Driver. T. and T. Clark. 7s. 6d.

This book, which is published under the auspices of the Society for Old Testament Study, is the result of a close and detailed examination of the Accadian verbal system, and its object is, by demonstrating the

strong Accadian strain in the Hebrew language, to throw light on various problems in connexion with the Hebrew tenses. It is impossible to review it at length without going into technicalities. It will perhaps be sufficient to say that it is a contribution to the study of Hebrew which will receive a warm welcome from those who know enough of that language, and of Accadian and Aramaic, to enable them to appreciate its arguments.

Mr. Godfrey Driver has a hereditary interest in the Hebrew tenses. He has also inherited some of his father's reluctance to adopt emendations of the Hebrew text. "An isolated usage of a particle or a tense or a termination must not be obliterated simply because it is unknown; it may be unique in Hebrew, but a parallel idiom may be found in one of the other languages. Even, too, though none can be found, what modern and often foreign scholar has the right to say that this or that cannot have existed? The pages of learned publications are strewn with the unfortunate results of an unimaginative and injudicious resort to the concordance."

S. L. Brown.

Concerning Himself. By Maisie Spens. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d. net.

The aim of every great moral teacher is to convey to his pupils the principles of the truth as he has learnt them for himself. He becomes the more effective teacher in so far as the truth has not only commended itself to his reason but has also found support and corroboration in his own experience of life.

It is this theme which Miss Spens seeks to expound in this most illuminating book. She takes the teaching of Jesus Christ and shews how it grows out of His experiences. It is a fascinating subject and receives ample justice at the hands of the author. It is the work not so much of a New Testament scholar as of a faithful Christian who has brought to a life-long study of the Bible a reverent mind and a devout spirit. The accurate theologian may find occasion to question some of the statements, but for the reverent handling of the subject no one could withhold a very full measure of gratitude and praise.

To turn to the book itself. The first result of reading it is to receive a picture of Christ Himself as revealed in the Gospels. His significance for His disciples, both then and now, is subordinated to the knowledge of what He was, and is, in Himself. To this end the author has assumed the historical validity of all four Gospels, and even though there be some occasional doubtfulness about the recorded sayings of Jesus yet that they represent the content of the "mind of Christ."

The difficulties of the Gospel chronology are overcome by grouping the teaching of our Lord under six headings: "The Mind of Christ," "Behold the Man!" "The Lamb of God," "The High Priest," "The Mystical Body," "Very God of Very God." In this way it becomes possible to deal both with our Lord's Being and His work. An appendix gives an alphabetical list of some of the sayings of Jesus which have been specially selected for treatment in the book.

For two reasons this book is specially to be commended. It will

help the ordinary Bible student to a method of study at once illuminating and fresh. Further it sets before the reader the only solution to the many and bewildering problems of today—a deeper knowledge of the Mind of Christ as the revelation of the glory of God.

H. L. Hubbard.

God's Way of Mercy. By Vincent McNabb, O.P. Burns Oates. 5s.

When young Vincent McNabb was seventeen, he said to himself, "I don't want to go to Hell; I think I will go to the Noviciate." The question presented itself to him, he tells us, as a clear choice. He did not want to go to Hell; and in an "entirely unsentimental" way he made up his mind to be a Religious.

And now, after many years of life and thought, he teaches other people; and, taking the Gospel for the day as text for an address, he reflects to himself, "I feel as if Mother Church says to me, 'Now, Father Vincent, that is what I put before my children today. Will you kindly take my children out for a walk and tell them about it?'"

So Father Vincent has definite choices, clear issues, simple statements and instructions to lay before his hearers. If problems have ever bothered him, they certainly have ceased to bother him now. He is quite sure of God's love and mercy, even of God's faith in His most tiresome and perverse children. He is quite sure that being good is incomparably better than being bad, and he longs for everyone else to be consistently sure too.

The book is curiously forceful. But the strength is not in the words themselves, for they are often trite enough. It must come from the man who says them.

Ælfrida Tillyard.

The Science of Prayer. By Michael Bruce, B.Sc. S.P.C.K. Paper, 2s.; cloth, 3s.

It is too often forgotten that the subject of prayer is indeed a science, and that in its practical applications it needs to be approached in a manner which shall make available to the worshipper the whole resources of the methods of prayer. Mr. Michael Bruce has written a really serviceable little book which clergy would do well to introduce to their congregations. He makes a survey of the scope of his subject, pointing out the need for reality in prayer, for intelligence in its use, and for prayer as a means to action. The author writes frankly of man's need for God and of the intimate manner in which prayer is linked up to fellowship, especially to the highest fellowship of all, the Holy Eucharist. He has an extremely useful chapter upon methods of prayer, and increases its use by adding some examples in an appendix. Mr. Bruce wrote his book with the especial needs of Chinese students in mind, but it is a book which will be of equal use to the everyday Christian at home. We have no hesitation in commending it highly.

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright.

Divine Causation. By W. J. Beale, M.A., B.D., D.Phil. Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

Dr. Beale has undertaken an important piece of research in a manner of sound scholarship. His general subject is that of "intermediaries." Commencing from the subject of causation, he traces the evolution of belief in a supreme Causal Agent, calling attention to some theories of the grounds of this belief. The student of the Old Testament will find these chapters of great use, especially that in which the author studies the part that divination has played in some primitive theories of the causal process. The rise of belief in intermediary beings between Yahweh and mankind is given a very full study. Dr. Beale traces the rise of the belief in Divine transcendence and illustrates the part which ideas of transcendence and immanence have played in the working out of a philosophy of religion. His solution is that of a synthesis between transcendence and immanence. His one chapter upon the New Testament data is good, but it might be expanded at greater length. Particularly interesting is his view that no belief in intermediaries can be traced to Jesus Himself. This is certainly an important book. It deserves to be studied and restudied. It is not too great an assertion that its author has opened up an entirely new line of research. We trust that his work will receive the attention that it deserves.

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright.

Systems of Meditation in Religion. By W. Loftus Hare. Philip Allan. 8s. 6d.

Another intelligent amateur has discovered that systems of meditation tend to be alike all the world over. Mr. Loftus Hare is inspired, he is kind enough to tell us, by Count Leo Tolstoy, by Mr. F. L. Rawson, "a distinguished Christian Scientist," and by Mr. A. E. Wodehouse, "the kind and scholarly General Secretary of the Order of the Star in the East." This is enough to let us guess that he has few prejudices and not much discrimination. Nevertheless, he has written a very charming book, and gathered together a number of interesting facts harvested from a most extensive field.

One would expect, of course, to find Hindu and Buddhist meditations explained, and Christian prayer considered chiefly as a technique. The chapters on Taoist practice, Greek contemplation, and Persian mysticism are more out of the common. From the pages devoted to Chinese mysticism I must quote the delicious passage from the Chwang-tze on the men of the Age of Perfect Virtue. One would almost have preferred it to the Miltonic Garden of Eden.

"They were upright and correct without knowing that to be so was Righteousness; they loved one another without knowing that to do so was Benevolence; they fulfilled their engagements without knowing that to do so was Good Faith; in their simple movements they employed the services of one another without thinking that they were conferring or receiving any gift; therefore their actions left no trace, and there was no record of any of their affairs."

Mr. Loftus Hare seems to think that, since men have everywhere

evolved somewhat similar ways of getting in touch with the spiritual world, it does not really matter very much what religious beliefs they hold. He thinks it is probably best for a man to take over the religion of the place where he happens to be. But suppose Mr. Loftus Hare lived in Boston, Mass., where there are as many religions as there are days in the year, what would he decide to believe ?

We have to remember, too, that meditation can be, and is, practised by Buddhists who ought to believe that they are only streams of consciousness, and that nothing really exists except states of mind. Is Mr. Loftus Hare prepared to maintain that the Beatific Vision is in no way superior to the beatific frame of mind ?

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

THE TEXT OF THE GREEK BIBLE. By Frederick G. Kenyon. Duckworth's Theology Series. 5s.

This is the standard manual in English on its subject, and will doubtless remain so unless, or until, new manuscripts are discovered. The opening chapter deals with books in the first three centuries, and shews that as early as the second century all the four canonical Gospels might have been circulated in papyrus codex form as a single unit.

The next chapter is given to the Old Testament, and calls special attention to the work of H. St. J. Thackeray in that connection. The third and fourth contain a descriptive list of all the most important manuscripts, both in the Greek text and in the versions of the New Testament. For the ordinary student this will be a constant stand-by, though the specialist will naturally need to supplement it by reference to monographs on particular subjects or families.

Then follows a chapter on the printed text, and this is succeeded by "Textual Discoveries and Theories, 1881-1936," and "The Present Textual Problem." These two final chapters are of great interest. Among other notices important for the history of the Gospels is that on "An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library," edited by C. H. Roberts, 1935, a scrap of a codex containing a few words of John xviii. 31-33, 37, 38, in a hand which can be referred with confidence to the second century. Among the other papyri the most important are the Michigan papyrus, 1571, with a text substantially that of the Codex Bezæ, proving that a text of this type was known in Egypt at least as early as the fourth century, and the Chester-Beatty papyri, particularly British Museum, Egerton pap. 2, containing fragmentary records of four incidents in our Lord's life, the first being a controversy with the Jews with phrases that recur in John v. and ix. This fragment must be assigned on paleographical grounds to the first half of the second century, and in the opinion of scholars shews a very early use of the canonical Gospels, and thus all the four Gospels go back to a first-century date, which, as Professor Kenyon remarks, "would have been invaluable for controversial purposes sixty years ago" (p. 195). To each chapter is attached a brief bibliography, and there is an excellent index.

F. J. BADCOCK.

MOSCOW THE THIRD ROME. Nicolas Zernov. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

The title of this work compels attention. The author shews that the belief expressed in *Moscow the Third Rome* has had a direct bearing on the development of Russian religion, for Moscow is held to be the successor and spiritual heir of Rome and Constantinople. Russia has been little understood by other countries. Her religion, art and culture remained practically unknown until the end of the nineteenth century, when the attention of other nations was first directed to her literature by Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. Since the revolution of 1917 much has been written about the political, social and economic life of the country, but the history of the Russian Church remains an enigma to many owing to the lack of knowledge of its Christian tradition. The study of this was largely hindered by the great schism of the seventeenth century and by the westernization of the country which followed it. The writer takes us rapidly through the history of the Russian Church, shewing her approach to the Christian Faith as one founded on her own tradition, and not a mere copy of the Byzantine Church. Vladimir of Kiev was converted to Christianity in 988, and this Prince Christianized the great mass of his people by the aid of priests brought from the Byzantine Empire. It was he who determined the future of the nation by associating it with the Eastern and not the Latin type of Christianity. According to legend, embodied in the Russian chronicle, Vladimir sent envoys to study all forms of religion; they reported that there was nothing so beautiful on earth as the services at St. Sophia in Constantinople, and consequently Vladimir chose the religion of the Byzantine Empire. Russia adopted the Byzantine form of worship, but it never remained a passive follower of Byzantium. The use of the Slavonic tongue in worship differentiated it from both the Greek and Latin Churches. This fact is responsible for the peculiar development of the Russian nation. The result of this adoption of the Slavonic language for worship brought about a spiritual isolation. The clergy knew neither Latin nor Greek, and the storehouse of theology and philosophy in those languages was inaccessible to them. Their studies were restricted to a limited number of sacred books translated into Slavonic. The Russia of the Middle Ages was nurtured not on Latin writers and Greek philosophers, but on a Slavonic psalter. With the fall of Constantinople in 1453, Russia continued to develop on its own lines. It held to the belief that it was raised up by God to defend the true faith and to continue the work begun by Constantine in the Byzantine Empire. Constantinople had failed; it had apostatized, so it was held, by entering into communion with the Latins at the Council of Florence in 1439. This conviction provided a soil on which the belief in Moscow, the third and last Rome, could take vigorous root. The author believes that the Russian soul lives on. In spite of the process of westernization, inaugurated by Peter the Great, the old tradition and ideals have never died, and one day will shew their influence in the life of the nation. The nineteenth century found Russian society in a complex state. There were "westernizers" and "nationalists"; some found their inspiration in the socialist and revolutionary movements of Western Europe, while others sought a development along more peculiarly Russian lines. To all appearances the revolutions both of 1905 and 1917 were the result of a clash between the two parties in which the bulk of the people remained passive spectators. In the end, they were the

decisive factor, for the peasants rose against the educated classes, wearied with the Western ideals of the liberal Government. It was a movement backwards, not forwards; its spirit was national, not international, and because it had no leaders and no policy, the victory fell into the hands of an ably led group of Communists. The author does not believe that Christianity has been defeated; Russia has still a message for the rest of Christendom. Meanwhile her people are under the heel of the Communists, who desire to eradicate a belief in God, but the heroic resistance of Russian Christians is one of the most glorious pages in the annals of Russian Church history. The aim of the writer is to destroy prejudices and misconceptions in the minds of his readers and to kindle a desire to know more of a Church now engaged in a struggle between those who deny, and those who assert the existence of, God. We think he has succeeded.

F. N. HEAZELL.

THE GNOSIS OR ANCIENT WISDOM IN THE CHRISTIAN SCRIPTURES, OR THE WISDOM IN A MYSTERY. By William Kingsland. Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.

This is a posthumous work of the late William Kingsland, a prominent theosophist. Its object is to point out to people dissatisfied with dogmatic and institutional Christianity that our religion in its origin sprang from Initiates in the Ancient Wisdom, which was taught in Egyptian and Greek Mysteries, and can be found in its best form in the religions of India. Jesus, probably an Essene, Paul and John were such Initiates, but what they taught was perverted and debased into false dogmas by the leaders of the Early Church, ambitious for worldly power.

Especially the identification of the historical Jesus with the Christ-Spirit, that is really and in truth present in every man, has been the bane of our religion, accounting for its exclusive claims, and attaching salvation to professed belief in historical assumptions, and doctrines wrongly built upon them. The Christ has been known by initiated souls of all races as a power within them, and Krishna is at least on a level with Christ. It is not difficult to find throughout the New Testament the Ancient Wisdom, thinly disguised and materially debased in the interests of a Church astray from truth. Such are the statements of theosophy focussed in this book on Christianity. It would not be difficult to shew its grotesqueness in face of what we know of the earliest Christianity, and of the long battle of the Church with the Gnostic Sects, but it would require considerable space even to outline a satisfactory reply.

It will be well for those who have to argue with theosophists to study this book, for it presents an accurate picture from the inside of their quite honest convictions.

As one reads it one wonders if it would not be helpful if some scholar with a sound knowledge of Gnosticism and of first-century Christianity would put in readable form in a short compass the obvious answers to the questions raised.

W. J. FERRAR.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher